

Q 900. c. 161. 71

~~16. 3. 71~~

THE

~~16. 6. 167~~

~~16. 6. 167~~

ECLECTIC REVIEW,

MDCCCXL.

JANUARY—JUNE.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. VII.

Φιλοσοφίαν δὲ οὐ τὴν Στωικὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικουρεῖον τε καὶ Ἀριστοτελικήν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἐκάστη τῶν αἵρεσέων τούτων καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σὺμπαν το ἘΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΟΝ φιλοσοφίαν φῆμι.

CLEM. ALEX. Strom. L. 1.

LONDON :

W. BALL, ARNOLD, AND Co., 34, PATERNOSTER ROW.

W. OLIPHANT AND SON, EDINBURGH; AND D. ROBERTSON, GLASGOW.

1840.



Academia Cantabrigiensi
Libra.

LONDON :

J. HADDON, PRINTER, CASTLE STREET FINSBURY.

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR JANUARY, 1840.

- Art. I. 1. *Report of the Committee of Homerton College. 1839.*
2. *Report of the Bristol Education Society for 1839.*
3. *Report of the Committee of Highbury College. 1839.*
4. *Report of the Committee of the Baptist College at Stepney for 1839.*
5. *Report of the General Committee of Spring Hill College, Birmingham, for the Session, 1838—1839.*
6. *Report of the Committee of the Baptist College at Bradford for 1839.*

THE following article on the Theological Colleges of the two large denominations by which our review is principally read, is written, we beg leave to state at the outset, without the slightest disposition to *croak*. Quite the contrary. While these institutions present some defects which in our opinion may be supplied—and these we shall honestly endeavour to point out—and while they admit of some improvements—which we shall take the liberty to suggest—we conscientiously think, that they present far more reason for exultation than depression; and that upon the whole they were never in so healthy and efficient a state as they are at this moment. Not only has the system of instruction in many of our older colleges been gradually enlarged to meet the exigencies of the times, but other colleges, entirely new, have recently sprung up, and promise both by the experiments they have an opportunity of making, and the healthy reaction which they cannot but produce, to exert a most salutary influence. It is but fair, also, to admit that many of the defects of which we shall have to complain, and which still circumscribe the usefulness of some of our colleges, arose out of the necessities of a past age; the demands of a perishing population were then out of all proportion to the

means of meeting them. Finally, it is no more than justice to add, that many of these evils have already been partially corrected. We write then only because we think that the defects in question may be still further remedied, and some additional improvements suggested in our general system of academical education.

Our readers will readily excuse us from entering into any controversy with those, whether Plymouth Brethren, or called by whatsoever other name, who imagine that the church of Christ is to be supplied with an adequate and efficient ministry without any system of ministerial education at all. To any persons but themselves such opinions appear to be too absurd to need refutation, while those who are weak enough to hold them are not likely to perceive the force of it. Two observations only we shall offer on this subject, for the benefit of those who may be in danger of adopting any such extravagancies. The first is, that the people of this age are certainly as little likely as those of any, to listen with much attention to men whom they do not think fully equal to themselves; as well informed on general subjects, and somewhat better informed on those in which they have undertaken to set up as public instructors. This feeling exists at least as strongly in the ignorant and uneducated as in the classes above them; perhaps we might say more so. It is scarcely once in a century that we hear of any considerable audiences being attracted by a man who has not had the advantages of education, either imparted by others, or supplied by his own industry; and never, we believe in all ecclesiastical history is there an instance of any considerable number of persons being collected and held together by a man absolutely illiterate; by any man, who was not, both in capacity and knowledge, many degrees above the mass of those who listened to his instructions. Something like an equality in general knowledge, and decided superiority in those branches which he aspires to teach, are proved by all experience to be necessary to the maintenance of the teacher's general influence (especially over the minds of the young and the ignorant), to insure respectful attention to the instructions communicated, and to impart to them their proper efficacy. Let a persuasion once take possession of the minds of an audience that the preacher is below the *mass* of his hearers, and all improvement is at an end. People may listen to criticise, perhaps to laugh, but they cease to be disciples.

Nor is it merely in relation to the duties of the pulpit that this general superiority is so desirable. In these times of extensive combination, and varied methods of doing good, a minister may be quite as useful out of the pulpit as ever he can be in it. Now such superiority alone will enable him to avail himself to the full of these opportunities of usefulness; this alone will confer upon him a prominent station in his immediate locality,

will qualify him for taking a leading part in the organization and working of important societies, and give that weight to his judgment which is inseparable from a reputation for well-disciplined intellect and extensive knowledge. But to secure such a position, and to acquire credit for such qualities as can alone secure it, efficient training and thorough education are absolutely necessary. To the truth of these observations all history and present experience bear loud testimony. Those who have been most useful, whether in the pulpit or out of it; who have most deeply impressed their own character on that of the age; who have not merely attracted and retained the largest audiences, but have exerted the strongest influence in their immediate neighbourhoods and throughout the church at large; who have taken the most prominent part in the formation and the advocacy of all comprehensive schemes of benevolence and piety, have certainly been by no means *destitute* of education. Not only so; but *cæteris paribus*, that is, the measure of intellect and other natural endowments being the same, their general influence in nine cases out of ten, is exactly proportioned to the degree in which that intellect has been disciplined and those endowments cultivated. Some of them, it is true, may not have received any prolonged academical advantages, a few of them, none at all; but they confirm the general rule, inasmuch as they have either received an excellent *early* education, or, being men of great natural energy of mind, they have supplied all deficiencies by their own indomitable industry, and have thus attained their position by the same vehicle, only by another route. We appeal to the whole history of the church in corroboration of these remarks. It was thus with the Reformers; it was thus with our Puritan and Nonconformist forefathers, who came forth from the seclusion of long study with minds well disciplined and richly stored with various knowledge; it was thus these men were rendered capable of easily performing tasks at which we stand aghast with wonder, of enduring labors with which few of modern times would like to compare their own, and of achieving good beyond all comparison greater than now attends the labors of the generality of our ministers. It was thus, too, with Whitfield and Wesley, who though not men of profound attainments, had both enjoyed those advantages of education of which they were not sufficiently solicitous that their successors should participate. It has been thus with all the most eminent men who have appeared in the societies they established; if they have not studied at colleges, they have been compelled to make up their deficiencies by their own industry. In other words, they have not attained their position *without* considerable acquisitions, though it matters not to the present argument in what way those acquisitions were made. It has been thus, also, with all the most eminent missionaries; with Martyn, Schwartz,

Corrie, Morrison, and Carey.* Were it not invidious, and indeed needless (for the memory of the reader will immediately supply examples) we could mention scores of living instances to the truth of these observations. On the other hand, we have tasked our memory, and tasked it in vain, to supply a single instance of an illiterate man attaining and keeping a position in which he could by possibility be extensively useful, or exert a wide and permanent influence on the general mind.

The second observation is, that if these things be so, it were nothing less than 'midsummer madness' to expect that the exigencies of the church could be supplied by accident. To hope that men, already well educated, fitted for other professions, perhaps already engaged in them, and thus not only destitute of early training for the specific work of the ministry, but debarred both by their age and the habits derived from other occupations from availing themselves of it, should offer themselves in sufficient numbers to meet the extensive demands of the church and the world, is of all things the most chimerical. A large portion, moreover, of those who upon the present system, are ultimately found amongst the most useful ministers, would be at once rejected, since they can neither afford the time nor the money to qualify themselves for their important functions by those advantages of education which we have already proved to be so essential.

On this point then we shall say no more ; we are confident that few of our readers will be inclined to impugn the statement that an efficient ministry must be an educated one.

With respect to the extent to which that education should be carried there may be, and there is diversity of opinion. On this subject, which has frequently engaged our most serious attention, we shall proceed to develop our views with all that freedom with which it is necessary to discuss opinions in order to elicit truth ; but at the same time with much timidity, being fully conscious of the difficulties which beset it. Our thoughts may to some appear crude ; they very probably are so ; but if they lead to the full discussion of the subject on the part of those to whom the chief management of our academical institutions is entrusted, our end will be answered.

* Here again we are far from meaning that all these individuals enjoyed much early education, though many of them did, or that their extensive knowledge was of the kind taught at colleges ; but we mean that they all added to whatever capacity they possessed, the advantage of well-disciplined faculties and extensive information—the latter by the labour implied in its acquisition insuring the former. Those, indeed, who had not received early advantages, obtained the same results by a longer process and through greater difficulties—an argument surely for a thorough early training ; but none of them ever reached eminence without such qualifications.

We beg to state then, *in limine*, that we much doubt the propriety of attempting to carry all the young men who may enter any particular college, whatever their age, whatever their previous advantages or disadvantages, whatever the diversity of their talents, through precisely the same course of training; to set young men, for instance, who are nearly thirty years of age, and who have had little previous instruction, to learn things which they never can learn thoroughly; in which they cannot even make such progress as to secure that mental discipline which is still more valuable than knowledge itself. We cannot help thinking that it would be better, either, if possible, to make such arrangements in each particular college as to secure a longer course of instruction and more extensive knowledge to those who are likely to derive the fullest benefit from them; or, if that be thought impracticable, to induce some of our colleges to restrict themselves to the education of one class of students, and others to the education of another. This, we are aware, could only be done effectually by mutual consent on the part of the colleges themselves; but any particular college has it virtually in its power to act upon this plan by refusing to admit students of all classes, whatever their diversities in point of age or talent; in other words, by restricting itself to the reception of such as are best fitted to derive benefit from the advantages it holds out.

Before we proceed further we beg to premise two observations, lest our meaning should be misunderstood. The first is, that while urging the propriety of adapting the quality and degree of education to the circumstances of the student, we would by no means have it supposed that we do not think a very thorough and prolonged training is in every case the best where it can be had; where, for example, the student is quite young, and has, therefore, ample time before him, or where his talents are unusually promising, and insure the probability of his deriving the full advantages of prolonged instruction, without wasting his own time or the public money. We never can think that a deficient education is abstractedly better than a complete one, or a little knowledge better than much. We advocate the plan above mentioned only because we think it is the best under all the circumstances; that it will secure the greatest possible efficiency on the part of those who can be profitably subjected to a protracted education, and a more *useful* preparation for the ministry, even on the part of those who cannot; since, upon the present system, by attempting to teach this latter class too much, they often learn nothing thoroughly; they gain neither accurate knowledge, nor, what is still better, the mental invigoration which the acquisition of accurate knowledge never fails to impart. Moreover the attempt to drag them on, though *haud passibus æquis*, with those who have enjoyed superior advantages or

possess greater talents, is injurious to both parties; to the one, by necessitating them to acquire much that they professedly study, in a slovenly or unprofitable manner; and to the other, by impeding their progress and checking their ardour,—the necessary effect of linking them with less strenuous and active associates. In fact, the tendency of such a system is inevitably to prevent the fullest development of the higher forms of talent, not only without advantage, but with detriment to the lower; in a word, to reduce all to the level of a dead mediocrity.

The second observation with which we wish to preface any further remarks on this subject is, that so far from desiring to lower the standard of ministerial education, it is our earnest wish, in this very way, to raise it. In our opinion we want a larger number of men 'thoroughly furnished;' of men who are fitted to occupy commanding stations and extensive spheres of usefulness; to take not only the oversight of large congregations, but to exercise a powerful influence in relation to society and the church at large, and by combining great intellectual vigour and extensive attainments with an elevated piety, to give weight, dignity, and importance to the ministerial character. Of the necessity of a larger number of such men, there cannot be a stronger proof than is supplied in the fact, that while there is always a sufficient, often more than a sufficient number of men, fully competent to take the inferior stations in our churches, it is often matter of extreme difficulty competently to supply important vacancies; and this fact alone, we apprehend, proves that there is somewhere or other a defect in our system of ministerial education.

It is not, then, because we think that a more restricted ministerial education is abstractedly better, or because we dream of lowering its general standard, that we plead for a change of system. Quite the contrary; it is because we believe that the one class of students might by this arrangement be subjected to a more efficient and protracted training,—thus always insuring an adequate supply of first-rate men,—and that even the other class, by being set to learn less, would learn that little well; thus at once securing the mental discipline which a smattering of many things will never give, and the power of applying the knowledge they possess with greater effect, simply because that knowledge, however limited, would at all events be accurate.

And let any one soberly consider, whether, with regard to a considerable class of students, this representation be not obviously correct. A young man of five-and-twenty or six-and-twenty years of age, of ardent piety, great sobriety of character, fair talents, but who has had few previous advantages—say, nothing but a plain English education, or little more—who has been engaged, we will suppose, in active business, and who has lost at the desk or behind the counter, a good deal of the small portion

of elementary knowledge he once possessed, earnestly covets the work of the ministry. Is the church in every such case to refuse the proffered service? We loudly say, no; and that it would be at her peril and to her own injury if she ever acted upon such a principle. There is no lack of stations in which such a man may be extensively useful. Nay, within a limited sphere he may, after passing through a certain course of preparation, be even more useful than a better trained man. Such are the diversities of congregations in point of magnitude, numbers, education, and intelligence, that there is no man possessed of that measure of talent and that amount of knowledge, without which the assumption of the ministry is in our opinion both folly and guilt, who may not be rendered useful. Moreover, the Christian church is in no condition to refuse such laborers, or to be unduly squeamish as to the agents she employs. Who, indeed, can look at the magnificence of the enterprise she contemplates, the overwhelming wants of a world of sin and misery, the teeming millions of our own population, far outstripping every effort that is made to meet its demands, without feeling that of the two evils it is better to fix the standard of qualification for the ministry too low than too high; to admit some few laborers into the vineyard not perfectly qualified for the task, than (for this is the real alternative) to be without them altogether? It is with food for the soul as with food for the body, it is better, in the language of the old proverb, 'to have half a loaf than no bread.'

But the question returns—what is the most efficient training to which such a man can be subjected? for we are supposing that, in the given case, it is decided that the youth is to dedicate himself *wholly* to the work of the ministry, and not merely attempt to be useful in any of the many valuable forms of lay-agency. He has never, it may be, seen the Latin grammar; as to Greek, he is not perfectly sure that there is such a tongue; of Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee, he knows just as little; mathematics are a profound mystery; the symbols of Algebra about as unintelligible as Egyptian hieroglyphics, and metaphysics as dark as Egyptian darkness itself. Is it desirable at this youth's age, to set him upon the hopeless attempt of learning all these things? Or is there the smallest rational prospect of his obtaining such an accurate knowledge of any portion of them as shall render them practically available, or (which we will always contend is the greater benefit) confer that discipline of mind, that invigoration of intellect, which is the direct effect of their profound study? No such thing. Even with that year, or two years of preliminary private study which our colleges (so long as they adhere to the present system) wisely enjoin upon such young men, previous to their entering upon their college course, such a result cannot be hoped for. What ensues upon his entering college? Necessarily

formed into classes with other young men, of younger years indeed but of far more pliable faculties, and in possession of considerable early advantages, it is found that he cannot go on as fast as they can, and that they must check their pace to enable him to keep up with them. The difference is split—a mean is struck, by which, as has already been said, both parties are losers. He is never able thoroughly to digest any thing, they never have enough to digest; he is gorged to repletion—they are half starved; he acquires a little knowledge of many things in a loose and unsatisfactory manner, while they, finding that they can do what is required of them with comparative ease, are likely to lose their time, and to fall into habits of indolence and mental dissipation. So long as it is necessary to form students into classes at all (and we have no hope that this necessity will ever cease to exist), we are aware that it will not be possible always to prevent those disadvantages which great diversities in point of talent, and some diversities in point of previous attainment, must now and then occasion. But they never ought to exist to the extent in which they now do. Indeed, if they were never greater than inevitable necessity occasioned, they would cease to be of any consequence, for they would be more than counterbalanced by the advantages which companionship in the same pursuits, and the honest emulation it cherishes, must always have over solitary study.

But not only is the young man, in the circumstances we have supposed, totally incapable of successfully prosecuting his multifarious and novel studies, not only does he stand a chance of impeding the progress of those who might do so, but such a plan is calculated to produce, or at least to cherish some of the worst faults which can belong to a public speaker, and which otherwise might never have appeared. We all know well enough what a dangerous thing a mere smattering of any science is, and the evil is only multiplied when instead of a smattering of *one* we have a smattering of *many*. Extensive attainment in at least one branch of knowledge is necessary to guard us from that affectation of learning, that ostentatious pedantry, and those vices of diction and of style which are ridiculous every where, but in the pulpit worse than ridiculous. Extensive attainments, except in a very few peculiarly and hopelessly constructed minds, will always tend to form a beautiful simplicity, and the greater part of the offences against it are the result, not of having acquired too much knowledge, but of not having acquired enough.

The course, then, to which we would restrict students of this lower class, should extend through three or at most not more than four years, and should comprise a thorough knowledge of the principles of English grammar and of English composition, an attentive study of the best portions of our literature, history, the elements of mental and moral science, and sound English theology,

doctrinal, controversial, and practical: such works being selected in each department, as *cæteris paribus*, shall be best calculated to exercise and stimulate the student's faculties, to extend his knowledge of his native language and his command over it — points to *him* of such vital importance—to improve his taste and to form his style. To this we would add a knowledge of the first four books of Euclid. This, though a very moderate portion of mathematics, would be enough to form an invaluable discipline, since even a very little attention to this science so eminently tends to sharpen the reasoning powers, to form the faculty of close attention and continuous thought, and (which is so essential to the public speaker) to facilitate the habit of retaining and giving expression to a connected train of argument.

We have already suggested two methods by which this project might be carried into effect; the first is that of inducing those who have the management of some of our smaller colleges (which have not yet set up an expensive apparatus of tutors, buildings, library, &c., with a view to a more enlarged education) to come to a magnanimous resolution to devote themselves to its accomplishment. As for the Congregationalists, it might surely be auspiciously attempted in connexion with the recent resolutions of the Congregational Union to attempt a comprehensive scheme of Home Missions, for the realization of which a large number of agents of the class now referred to, will be imperatively demanded, and would be pre-eminently useful. It can, perhaps, be hardly expected that any of our larger colleges, which have established a costly machinery with a view to a more thorough training, should dedicate themselves exclusively to this object.—The second method, if the former should be thought impracticable, is that of endeavoring to combine the two objects in the same institutions, by admitting the class of students to which we now refer only to certain classes and for a more limited term of years. Our colleges would thus be enabled to extend the education of those who are likely to derive full benefit from such an arrangement, as well as to increase the appliances of study. This in our opinion would be very preferable to the plan of attempting to carry all the students through the same course, and retaining them for the same term of years; a plan attended with all the manifest disadvantages to both parties to which we have already adverted.

If it should be objected that the lack of previous advantages is a good reason for extending the term of study, but not for curtailing it, and for teaching more, but not for teaching less, we reply that we are speaking of those who have arrived at an age which renders time of considerable importance, and who from their early disadvantages, and the want of flexibility of mind, can only derive a certain measure of benefit from *any* course of train-

ing to which they may be subjected, and with reference to whom, therefore, all training beyond a certain point is a waste of time and money; a waste of time to the parties themselves, who might be employing it to better purpose in active usefulness, and a waste of money to the public, whose benevolent contributions might be more profitably expended on other objects. In such cases as these the result does not pay for the cost. We often think it well worth while to spend twenty pounds on an object which we by no means think would pay for an outlay of a hundred. On the other hand, if a youth who has been, after a deliberate examination of all the circumstances, put into this class, exhibit such promising talents, and make such a rapid progress as to justify the belief that he would repay the cost of a more protracted education, it were easy to draft him into an institution of higher character, upon the supposition that different colleges devoted themselves to the two different objects, or into the higher classes of the same institution, upon the supposition that the two objects were carried on in combination under the same roof.

In order to give the greatest possible efficiency to this plan, and to make both classes of students as useful as possible, we would have a severe judgment exercised in the first instance on the probable success of every candidate who aspires to the exercise of the ministry amongst us; and that not merely in reference to his religious character (which we rejoice to say has always been the case), but to his mental qualifications. In addition to those indications of piety which have always been so justly demanded by our colleges, as an indispensable pre-requisite to entertaining the remotest application of this nature (and this in our opinion constitutes the peculiar glory of the Dissenting ministry), we would have at least one of two other qualifications absolutely insisted upon in every case; either *striking talents* to make amends for the lack of early advantages, or *great previous advantages* to make amends for feeble talents. Without one or the other of these, no one whatever should be encouraged to aspire to an office so arduous and so responsible. This is alike demanded by duty to the public, to the church, and to the individual himself: to the public, whose money ought to be expended only where it is likely to realize the objects for which it is contributed; to the church, because its interests are not likely to be promoted by a feeble and inefficient ministry; and to the individual himself, because, if he is thrust into the ministry destitute alike of talents and of knowledge, he is taken out of a sphere of life in which he might have been humbly useful, and is thrown into one in which he cannot be of much use to others, and inevitably insures his own misery.

Respectability in a private station, oftentimes considerable property, and therefore valuable influence, may be acquired with very little knowledge and very slender talents; respectability

in the ministry never can. In many such cases, therefore, the sole talent has been taken away, and the church as well as the individual has been a loser. A minister of very feeble capacity, and oppressed by poverty, is but a poor exchange for a private Christian of the same slender capacity, possessed of the influence which business, and perhaps considerable wealth may command. A guinea acquired by honest trade, and freely spent in the cause of Christ, is in our opinion of at least as much worth to the church as a very bad sermon. It is our painful conviction that in times past our colleges have not been sufficiently cautious on this point, and hence that most distressing spectacle, not infrequently seen, of men of unimpeachable excellence of character struggling through life with overwhelming poverty, because they really have not the power to attract or retain a congregation that can adequately support them.

On those students who shall be deemed, from their comparative youth (and who have therefore plenty of time before them), from early advantages, and from other circumstances, likely to derive the fullest benefit from it, we would then bestow a thorough education, giving them never less than six years, two of them to be devoted exclusively to science and literature, one partly to these, and partly to the elementary studies of theology, and three years exclusively to theology. If they have already pursued science and literature up to the requisite point at colleges dedicated to secular learning, they might be admitted at once to the Theological course, which even in that case should, in our opinion, be never less than four years. We shall speak of the intellectual advantages likely to be secured by such a protracted course of study by and bye. We shall here only advert to one point which we are persuaded has been far too much overlooked. We consider that one great advantage of this prolonged course of study would be, that the student who enters upon it, even though he commenced it young, would never be permitted to assume the responsibilities of the pastoral office before he had arrived at something like manhood of intellect and maturity of judgment; before he had attained some experience of human nature, and some insight into his own character; before the impetuosity of youth was softened down, and the powers of reflection developed. It seems to be imagined by many, that the sole task of tutors is to infuse into the mind of the ministerial candidate sufficient knowledge and sufficient facility in communicating it, and the work is done; pre-supposing of course the possession of undoubted piety. Never was there a greater mistake. The office of pastor and of bishop implies some talent for government; consequently a sound judgment, a knowledge of human nature, some practical acquaintance with the diversities of temper and disposition; and above all, that self-control which nothing but

ripeness of character, and a little experience of life can impart. In these respects, tutors and books may indeed do something, but time is a still better teacher than either. There is a great difference in point of development between the judgment of a man of twenty, and that of a man of five-and-twenty, putting out of sight altogether the advantages which spring from spending that interval in the active pursuit of knowledge and the strenuous cultivation of the intellect. The rashness and vehemence of early youth are in some measure repressed, a portion of the vanity which is inherent in us all rooted out, and the self-willedness and obstinacy which are almost equally common at a certain age, corrected as we advance to manhood. To us, we confess, there seems something absolutely preposterous in calling upon a youth of one or two-and-twenty to govern four or five hundred of his fellow-creatures, of every conceivable variety of age, temper, and circumstance; to govern them too in the most difficult of all possible ways—not by despotic authority, by the mere brute energy of an irresistible will, but by moral influence, by gentle suasion, by skilful management, by the combination of wisdom and kindness, of prudence and love;—to govern them also in the most difficult of all matters, those which relate to their moral and spiritual well-being. And yet it is at this early age that some of our ministers undertake the heavy duties of the pastorate! Though in some few instances the experiment has turned out well, the result is to be attributed only to unusual solidity of character manifested at a very early age, and is altogether beyond the calculations of human prudence and sagacity. On the other hand, we are inclined to believe that in a large proportion of the instances in which an early separation takes place between a youthful pastor and the flock who have chosen him as their spiritual guide, the consequences are mainly attributable to premature settlement. The young minister then removes to another place, and possessed of more self-knowledge, and taught much by experience, he probably succeeds; but that knowledge and that experience he ought never to have been left to buy so dear. Now if a youth of eighteen be subjected even to the lengthened course of training for which we plead, he is still only four-and-twenty years of age when he undertakes the duties of governing a church; if he be twenty when he begins, he is still only six-and-twenty, and will any one in his senses contend that he ought to have entered upon so difficult a task a single hour earlier? We have insisted the more strongly upon this point because we believe it to be one of vital importance. If a man had the genius of an angel, and the knowledge of an angel to back it, unless he could also lay claim to angelic purity and love, he should not with our good-will be permitted to enter upon the duties of a ruler of the church, or undertake the man-

agement of the spiritual interests of a multitude of human beings, a single hour under five or six-and-twenty years. Of all incongruities in the world, the most incongruous, in our opinion, is that presented in a boy-pastor.

If only on these grounds then we would advocate a prolonged education for the class of students now under consideration. But there are other advantages, connected with their intellectual fitness for the ministry, which scarcely less loudly proclaim the propriety of this course.

It is often triumphantly asked by those who have only superficially considered the matter, and who entirely overlook some of the chief purposes of education, 'of what use is it 'to stuff the head of a youth who is designed for the ministry, 'with Latin, Greek, Mathematics, Logic, Mental Philosophy, 'and so forth? What are all these things in relation to the gospel of Christ? The man is not to teach the classics, or science, 'but to explain and enforce religious truth.' All this is nothing to the purpose; these things are not taught him because he is to teach them to others; but first, for the sake of that discipline of mind which they impart; to develop his faculties, and to enable him to exert those faculties with facility on whatsoever subjects demand their exercise; to strengthen the memory, to exercise the judgment, to refine the taste, to form habits of close attention, patient investigation, and continuous thought, in relation to any subject which may come before him. The proper object of a thorough *general* education, as Dr. Johnson well observes, is not so much to fit the mind for any particular department of exertion (for this is the object of a strictly professional education), but to prepare it to engage with the greatest probability of success in that department of exertion, whatever it be, to which circumstances may determine it. Now the above classes of study, pursued under different modifications and to a different extent in various schools, have been thought in all ages better adapted to this great end of general discipline than any others, and all experience confirms the judgment. If there were any others that would answer the purpose equally well, they would have equal claims to be chosen, but then the objection if it were valid at all, would equally apply to these also, for they must be equally alien from pursuits strictly professional, and would be selected not with a view to *them*, but to the great object of mental training. It little matters whether this mental discipline be imparted, as is generally the case with students for the ministry, in the very same institution, in which the strictly professional education is also given, or whether in a separate school or college. It must be *imparted* some where and in some way. Thus it is we act with boys and with young men who are designed for any department of professional life, and

even with those who are designed for any common business. A boy is sent to school to learn grammar, arithmetic, perhaps to acquire some knowledge of Latin and Greek, and the elements of the mathematics, the greatest part of all which in nine cases out of ten, has little or no relation to the business to which he is to be apprenticed, and in which he is to spend the strength of his days. Nay, almost all that he learnt at school he may perchance forget, and in the greater number of instances it is actually forgotten within a couple of years of his leaving it. Why then do we act thus? Why is a boy sent to school to learn much that shall have little or no relation to the occupation for which he is designed, and nine-tenths of which he will shortly cease to remember? To exercise and develop the powers of his mind, to be sure; to impart that facility of using his faculties, and that general knowledge, which could not so well be acquired any where else or by any other means. This is the reason; and we should assuredly laugh at any man who acted in defiance of it. We should condemn even a butcher, who instead of sending his son to school at seven years of age, set him to learn his business, in preference to the spelling-book and the multiplication-table. Still more should we condemn a medical man, who because he designed his boy some day to be a practitioner, should put him at ten years of age behind a counter, to weigh out powders, and mix up draughts.

In the case of those who are destined for the higher professions with which handicraft skill has nothing at all to do; in which the mind is the sole instrument with which the mind itself operates; in which to investigate, to reason, to persuade, and such like things form in fact the great business of life, a more prolonged and thorough discipline is usually thought, and justly thought, to be necessary. In no profession is this severe training generally supposed to be more requisite than in those which involve public speaking. Is the ministry to be the only exception?

This then is the sufficient justification of putting youths to study things which are not immediately connected with the duties of their after-life, and which, as we have already said, would not be a whit less worth their study, even if every syllable connected with them passed away from the memory in a few short years after they were acquired. There are comparatively few members of any of the learned professions, however sound their early education, who retain in advanced life many vestiges of their early scholarship. Crabbed constructions in Latin and Greek, difficult equations in algebra, abstruse theorems in geometry, once perhaps easy enough, would puzzle them *now* effectually. But the benefit derived from these studies at the time they were pursued, is permanent, and continues

to operate through life. They tended to secure habits of patient thought and of minute accuracy, to strengthen the memory and to sharpen the reason. It is with such knowledge, as with the food taken into our bodies; as food it is changed and lost, but a great part has passed into bone, cartilage, and sinew, and this is sufficient. For this reason alone, if there were no other, there would be good ground for including in the thorough training which we contend for, a knowledge of Latin and Greek; and on similar grounds, if there were no such languages in existence as Latin and Greek, we should still plead for the acquisition of some languages beside our own. The study of a foreign language forms a distinct species of mental exertion, and involves many processes of intellect peculiar to itself, and characteristic of no other species of discipline. Some such knowledge, moreover, is essentially necessary to let us into the nature and powers of language in general; and how important it is that a public speaker, whose very instruments are *words*, should be fully possessed of this knowledge, it is almost superfluous to say. Accustomed from infancy to our native language, familiar with all its idioms and constructions, it is not until we see how the general purposes of speech are answered in other languages, nor until attention is arrested by peculiarities in construction and idiom with which we may compare those of our mother-tongue, that we become fully acquainted with the nature and powers of this wonderful instrument, with the relation of *words* to *mind*. If then there were not a syllable of the classics extant, we should still plead for the desirableness of learning some language, beside our own. The reasons, indeed, which upon this supposition, determine a preference of Greek and Latin are so obvious as to require no mention. Not only do they contain such vast treasures of literature, not only are they necessary to the prosecution of all those portions of history which are essential to the theologian, but the first is that in which the New Testament is written, and in which the best of the Fathers wrote, while the second was for centuries the current language, the mother tongue, of theology. Wherever it is possible, therefore, it is obviously desirable that theologians should have something like access to them.

But though mental discipline is the chief benefit to be derived from the protracted education for which we plead, it is far from being the only one. Another and scarcely less important end, is that of furnishing the mind with those kinds of knowledge which must be attained if a man would be extensively useful. Now it is only in perfect seclusion for a considerable period, that a young man has leisure to acquire the knowledge of those arts and sciences which, as the Directory of the Westminster Assembly well expressed it, are 'handmaids to Divinity,' as well as those stores of general information which will furnish the

materials of ready and ever-varied illustration. Without some such mental furniture, it is as vain to hope to meet the ever-recurring demands of the pulpit with tolerable facility, or to secure to public ministrations the requisite degree of variety, as it would be to make bricks without straw, or to transact an extensive business without a competent capital. Every hearer can at once detect, in any man's preaching, the difference between a full mind and an empty one.

Now unless this intellectual capital be acquired during a period of comparative seclusion and leisure, one of two things invariably happens, both of which show how desirable it is that a certain portion of time should be sacredly appropriated to this object; either we subject a man to the cruel necessity of acquiring this requisite knowledge for himself in the midst of the absorbing cares and onerous duties of the ministry, to the infinite hazard of his health, and perhaps the detriment of his flock, or he never acquires it at all. If a man possess great physical vigor and great mental energy, he will probably take the former course, and we know of several men who, to their unspeakable honor, have done so. They have themselves told us that becoming aware of the slenderness of their acquirements, when they had already entered upon their public duties, they have been compelled to endeavor to combine severe private study with the discharge of their public functions, to the prejudice however of their health, and in some measure to the temporary injury of their congregations. Now though they ultimately assumed the standing to which such industry entitled them, and became more useful than they could otherwise have been, yet the full measure of their popularity and of their success was necessarily postponed for some years beyond what it might have been if they had acquired the requisite knowledge before they found themselves actually immersed in the anxieties and labors of their high office. It is a piece of cruelty to necessitate such men to make so hazardous an experiment at all.—But the worst still remains to be told. The greater number will not even make the experiment. Those who possess no more than average abilities and no great physical strength, finding it impossible to combine much study with the numerous and heavy duties of their public ministry, content themselves with working up again and again their little stock of materials. As a consequence, they inevitably fall into a trite and barren style of preaching in which there is nothing to arrest attention, and become at the best far less useful than they might have been. Nay, owing to these causes, it is not an unprecedented thing—and we know of no fact more lamentable in the whole history of our ministry—to see ministers far more acceptable and popular at the commencement of their career than at the termination of it. This should be a warning, preg-

nant with instruction to all students. Totally incapable, from want of experience, of estimating that degree of mental furniture which will enable them readily to meet the requirements of their office, and finding that they can get on pretty well in their occasional efforts on a small stock of sermons, (upon which it may be a great deal of labour and the whole of their little knowledge has been expended), they are often ready, and even anxious, to plunge prematurely into public life, to take upon them the discharge of their professional duties, without any thought of the Horatian maxim—

. . . . ‘Versate diu, quid ferre recusant,
‘Quid valeant humeri.’

But this very incapability of right judgment on the part of the student (necessarily resulting from want of experience), ought to be an additional reason for securing to him those advantages of quiet study from which urgent and multifarious duties will ever afterwards debar him. In confirmation of these remarks, we may observe, that we have heard many ministers say, as soon as a little experience had entitled them to form an opinion, that they heartily wished the term of preliminary training had been longer or more wisely spent, but we never heard one say that it would have been better if he had earlier committed himself to the duties of his station.

On the other hand, if a solid and extensive foundation of knowledge has been laid during a period of studious leisure, and those invaluable habits of mind formed which are involved in the very acquisition of such knowledge, it becomes comparatively easy for the minister in after life, to keep up all that he has acquired, and even to make fresh accumulations. With well-trained faculties, facility of application, and tolerably extensive attainments, he can make more out of his scraps of leisure than other men, less favorably circumstanced, could make out of their whole time. Precisely similar observations apply, and if possible with increased force, to the necessity of a thorough *theological* training. Those species of critical and historical knowledge, which lie at the basis of sound theology, are never likely to be acquired except by continuous study, pursued at leisure, under the eye of an instructor; never by desultory effort at broken intervals, and amidst the ten thousand cares of the public ministry.

Another purpose, not quite so obvious, but scarcely less important, to be subserved by this thorough education, is this; that it gives a man that position and influence in general society, which, if it were possible, no minister should ever be without. It is true that in this point of view, his knowledge is not immediately

applied to the discharge of his official duties, but it indirectly aids them ; it gives him admission to those who otherwise would be inaccessible ; conciliates the respect of those who would otherwise despise him ; and above all, renders him an object of vastly increased reverence to the mass of his common hearers. It imparts weight and importance also to his judgment on matters which, though not immediately connected with the pulpit, are by no means unconnected with human happiness, or with the progress of religion ; and in these days, when, as already said, so much of the good that is to be done must be done *out* of the pulpit, no one of common sense will think this a slight advantage. It is of no use for us to chafe at what are the fundamental laws of all human society ; God has so constituted it, that the influence of men over the higher ranks, and still more over the lower, will ever be in proportion, not to their moral excellence alone, but to the degree in which that excellence is associated with a reputation for solid judgment and a mature knowledge.

In order to secure to the full the benefits of such a system of training, it is absolutely necessary that the student should not be permitted to *preach* too soon or too often during his academical career. This we consider a vital point, and shall therefore dwell upon it at some length. Far be it from us to deny that it is absolutely necessary that in some shape or other he should be familiarized with what are afterwards to be his great duties, long before he leaves college. It is most desirable that he should be accustomed to exercise his talents for public speaking, both that he may gradually attain self-possession, command of language, and facility of utterance ; and, what is still more important, that he may be continually impressed with a salutary remembrance of what is after all the great, the avowed end of all his studies and all his pursuits. But then, as this is the *object* of these engagements, so they should not be more numerous than is necessary to secure it. If there be institutions which have erred in not letting students preach enough, there have been others which have erred to an equal extent in suffering them to preach too much.

In the first place, if the term of study be six years, and the student enter young, as in that case he would, it appears absolutely necessary that he should confine himself exclusively to study during at least the first two years. It is only in this way that he can be subjected to that continuous application, the object of which is to form those habits of mind which we have already described as so valuable, and in fact as the great end of academical discipline. If his pursuits be at this period often intruded upon, if he be called off from them to prepare prematurely for public engagements, his attention is dissipated by variety of objects ; he gets

into a slovenly way of doing things, of doing them not as well as he could, but as well as time permits, while from being obliged frequently to intermit his proper studies, there are breaks and chasms in them, which he has no time to supply. In such a case, both sound discipline and accurate knowledge are out of the question, since both depend upon concentration and continuity of effort exerted upon some few pursuits for a certain period of time. 'We speak that we do know, and we testify that we have seen.' A student, at an early period of his career, is informed that he is to preach three times on the following sabbath, some thirty miles from the scene of his studies. He has but two sermons in the world—perhaps but one; and, now trembling with fear, now elated with hope, he hastens to make some preparation for the work, certainly to the partial, perhaps total neglect of his present studies for a day or two. Or, it may be, he has preached at the same place before, and having become, therefore, a bankrupt in sermons, is necessitated to give a still larger portion of time to some sort of preparation. He spends a part of the Saturday in preparing for his journey, and in travelling to his destination. As yet unaccustomed to the labors of the pulpit, a sabbath is to him a day of intense excitement and severe effort of mind, terminating in deep exhaustion. He spends a portion of the Monday in travelling back to his college, and arrives there so jaded and wearied in body and in mind, as to be little fit for any thing that day, and not fit for very much the next; perhaps also with some little disrelish for those silent and recluse studies which have only prospective utility to recommend them, utility which from his very inexperience he is unable fully to appreciate, and is therefore too apt to underrate; studies, too, which are attended with no present excitement, and with no flattering though dangerous gratulations. If the courses of study which he has been thus compelled to intermit or partially to neglect be closely connected in their several parts—as for instance, the Mathematics, Logic, or Mental Philosophy, or certain departments of Theology, he has not vigor, or even time enough satisfactorily to make good by his own unaided efforts the gap which his engagements have occasioned, and at the same time to keep pace with the progress of the class. The consequence is that those portions of the courses in question are never satisfactorily mastered; while, from the manner in which they are interwoven with all the rest, the remainder is also necessarily acquired in a perfunctory and slovenly manner; and thus the student arrives at its termination not only with that mere smattering of the subject, which is worse than no knowledge at all, but without that benefit of mental discipline which would have resulted from thoroughly mastering it, and which is in some cases the only sufficient reason for paying any attention to it at all. We

repeat that we speak from experience, that we paint from life.

Again, it seems desirable, for another obvious reason, that during a considerable portion of the whole term of study, students should not be permitted to preach at all. In sending them to a college to prepare them for the ministry, it is surely supposed that they have something to learn before they preach, or why send them there?—it is surely supposed that they are not yet in any way fit to undertake the important office to which they have dedicated themselves? Now, by suffering them to preach too soon, we not only set at naught this maxim, and lose or at least diminish the opportunities professedly given for supplying these deficiencies, but in some cases render it impossible that they should ever be supplied: for in these very early efforts are too often acquired or confirmed that false taste and that vicious style, which it is a thousand times more difficult to unlearn than simply to avoid; and which, in fact, would in most cases have been avoided, if a little wholesome instruction had been timely administered. As it is, a great part of the instructions of subsequent years is consumed in counteracting and correcting the faults of premature practice; what might have been effectual as a preventive, is too often only partially efficacious as a remedy.

For these reasons we must insist on the necessity of sacredly reserving a considerable portion of the whole term of study to the purposes of study; nor do we think it difficult to show, that even during the remainder of it, preaching engagements should not be very frequent. We have already spoken of the absolute necessity that students should not come unpractised to the regular discharge of their ministerial functions, and so far therefore as it is necessary to secure this object, some public exercises become both requisite and beneficial; but as this is *the* object, so would we strictly confine ourselves to it: not a step further would we go.

None, we apprehend, will deny the desirableness of uniformly endeavouring to bring about these results as gradually and silently as possible; that there may be no sensible violence done to a youth's habits, no sudden stepping from secluded study into the front of a large congregation. For a considerable time he should be habituated only to address very humble audiences, in rooms or very small chapels, and that of the poorer and more ignorant classes; and this, not only that the great ends of study (still diligently prosecuted) may be answered (and such duties would require no very formidable preparation), but for other and still weightier reasons connected with his moral and spiritual improvement. In the first place, such duties can hardly inflate his vanity; they present little scope for ambition; the youthful laborer must be urged on, and sus-

tained in their performance solely by his desire of doing good. His best feelings are therefore at once called forth, and his soul is in harmony with his work. Not only so. Actuated by such feelings,—without any reflex reference to himself or his own doings,—he is likely both to acquire a simple and natural style of address, and to attain that self-possession which will be necessary in more important and arduous engagements. To these he will thus at length be brought, through many different stages, by a long process, and without any violence to his habits. Secondly, such engagements can hardly depress him by fear of failure; which, perhaps next to self-complacency is least in harmony with the state of mind in which we should enter upon such engagements—engagements which should always be contemplated with serene delight and holy satisfaction.

It is not uncommon (we again speak of what we know), to see these evils combined where a youth has been too rapidly brought forward, and without due attention to that very gradual process which shall make the transformation of the student into the preacher almost as imperceptible as that by which the boy ripens into the man. A distressing timidity, which has been attended before a formidable service with a total oblivion of all but the duties in prospect, has been followed, after a tolerably successful performance of them, by feelings of complacency still more injurious to character; while the absorbing fear of failure and the self-complacent gratulations upon success, are equally ruinous, for a time, to mental equanimity, and the quiet pursuit of study.

Say what we will, it is, and cannot but be a fearful trial, in the first place, of a youth's courage and fortitude; and, in the second, of his humility, modesty, and spirituality, to place him without long training, and except by a very slow process, before the eyes of a considerable audience, who are to sit in silence and listen to what he says.

Happily for our times, there are ample opportunities of thus gradually familiarizing a student with the more important duties which await him; and it gives us sincere pleasure to add, that those who are entrusted with the care of our colleges are by no means slack to avail themselves of them. The stations of the Christian Instruction Society and other similar societies, now established in many of our cities and large towns, (would to God they were established in all of them!) and the little chapels which are raised in secluded hamlets and villages, afford abundant facilities for this important initiation. Our only complaint is, that even these duties are in many cases entered upon by the student too soon, and that in others, still more numerous, they *are not persisted in long enough*. A student is introduced too early to more important and arduous fields of labor. It will be seen from these remarks, that it is only by a very gradual process

that we would permit students to appear before regular congregations at all, and would reserve their opportunities of doing this until quite a late period in their academical career. This we would do both for the reasons just assigned, and because we would secure as large a portion of their time as possible for the continued pursuit of those studies which after all are the main reason for their coming to college, and which, while they remain there, ought to be regarded as of paramount importance. Now, to preach frequently before congregations which demand considerable preparation, must be attended with an almost entire neglect of study.

When we consider what is the great object of sending a youth to a theological college,—that it is to fit him for a whole life of labor—to fit him for engaging with efficiency for a period somewhere between twenty and thirty years (for such is the *average* of the life of our ministers after they have assumed the pastoral office) in a work the most arduous and responsible that can demand the energies of man, it seems to us little less than infatuation to endanger the probability of success, by either stinting the period of study, or rendering it less effective than it might be. Yet this latter is done if we impose upon the student public engagements which demand much of his time, and tend to distract his attention. In relation to the whole period of labor in which, after his college life, he is to be engaged, what are a few months, or even a year or two? What good can be effected by his casual labors on a few sabbaths, that can counterbalance the probability of his entering with diminished powers of usefulness on a career of five and twenty years' labor? Surely if ever there was an illustration of the old proverb about being 'penny wise and pound foolish,' this is it.

It is often said, that if young men are zealous in the great cause to which they have devoted themselves, it is a pity that that zeal should be repressed, and that they should not at once commence their public duties. We answer, that it is admitted on all hands that zeal alone is not sufficient—it must be tempered with wisdom, and conjoined with knowledge. The great object is, so to form the character,—the character both of mind and heart,—that zeal in the great work may burn with a steady as well as with a brilliant light for the course of a whole life; and we again say, that it is the grossest folly, to endanger so great an object by anticipating the period at which the student can with efficiency enter upon his public labors, or by rendering his preparation less thorough and complete than it might be, for the sake of a few sabbaths' occasional labors. We are convinced such saving will in general be dearly paid for, and such economy, prove the most lavish expense.

Upon the whole, then, if we suppose six years devoted to the

higher kind of education,—and we would by no means have it less,—we would not suffer any young man (unless he has enjoyed elsewhere such peculiar advantages and such efficient training, as to justify his instant admission to the theological classes) to preach in any way for the space of at least two years. If there were no reason for this connected with his studies, his mere youth, his insufficient knowledge, and his utter want of preparation, ought to be sufficient ones. For the next two years he should be permitted occasionally to exercise his talents in the humble and unobtrusive ways already pointed out, among the poorer and more ignorant classes, in rooms, and at village stations; the frequency of these efforts, and the magnitude of his audience gradually increasing in proportion as he became accustomed to the work. But at no period of these two years should he be permitted to engage in such duties oftener, upon an average, than every third sabbath. During the last two years he might be permitted to supply regular congregations: the frequency of his labors here also, and the importance of the stations to which he is sent, gradually increasing as the term of his study drew near to its conclusion. Thus slowly and by a long process familiarized with his work, he is preserved from all those dangers, whether intellectual or moral, which attend too sudden a change; no such formidable demands are made upon his time as to require him to infringe upon his studies; those studies may be pursued with nearly as much efficiency as ever up to the very close of his academical career—perhaps we might say with even more efficiency, for if he have not quite as much time for them, the previous discipline which uninterrupted study has conferred has given him such control of his faculties, and such habits of attention, as to enable him to do more in one day than he had formerly been able to do in two; no demands are made upon his knowledge until he has obtained some knowledge to meet them, and as those demands gradually increase, his knowledge increases too. Above all, we should have the best security that could be offered against those moral dangers, those temptations to vanity, affectation, and ambition, to which the sudden transmutation of the raw student into the preacher is so apt to give rise. Each step is so slow, that he himself is hardly sensible of the change through which he has passed, except by looking back upon long intervals of time—not upon days or months, but years.

On no account, however, would we permit students, even of the last two years, to engage in public more frequently than upon every alternate sabbath. To this general rule, as to every other, we are well aware that there must be some exceptions, but they should be the exceptions. And we would adhere to this general rule, not only for the sake of securing, in a considerable degree,

those advantages of study which, as we have so often said, are the chief reasons for the students remaining at college at all, but *for his own spiritual improvement also*. This is a point which we are persuaded is too frequently overlooked, and yet it is one of very great importance. When we consider that after the term of study is over, the student must look for no more quiet Sabbaths, no more such seasons of tranquil retirement, no more such opportunities of prolonged meditation and devotion as he has heretofore enjoyed, who, that properly considers how valuable such privileges are, and that they can never return, would wish a young man to be prematurely deprived of them? To him they are absolutely essential if he would maintain the life of religion in his own spirit, and counteract by reading, reflection, and devotion, the influence of absorbing studies and of public engagements. We must recollect, moreover, that to the student some such seasons are the more necessary, inasmuch as his public duties, from their being at first of a more formidable character, and from their engrossing influence on his time and attention, leave him less able to make use of those scraps of time which men who have been long engaged in the work know how to turn to a good account. The self-possession and the facility in public speaking, which long practice secures, will enable an aged and experienced minister to regard his great task without that overwhelming anxiety which the young man must necessarily feel. It no longer disturbs his slumbers, haunts his privacy, or intrudes upon the hour which in the very prospect of it he can calmly dedicate to God and his own soul.

As we would permit students originally destined for the more limited course to enter on the more extended one, upon giving indications of unusual talents, so upon the like appearances we would give to some of the students now under consideration, an additional year or two (before entering on their theological curriculum) at some university, for the purpose of taking their degree as Master of Arts. We ought to have among us a larger number of men who have successfully contended for academical honors with the mass of other students. A certain proportion of such men would tend to give respectability to the body to which they belong, and serve as tangible evidence that the colleges at which they must have received the greater part of their education, were conducted on sound principles. The additional expense of enabling a few thus to carry their education to the highest point, would be amply covered by relinquishing the attempt to drag all students, whatever their age or advantages, through the self-same course.

Before we conclude this part of the subject, it may not be irrelevant to advert to some of those objections which are urged against the system of prolonged education, on the score that it is apt to exert a prejudicial influence on the character of the preaching of

every one who has been subjected to it. It is apt, so some say, to produce a style of preaching destitute of earnestness and feeling, inanimate, or coldly correct, or critical, or metaphysical, but at all events without passion or pathos. Now, we admit that it is eminently desirable to guard against such results, and that this can be done only by gradually and insensibly bringing a youth into contact with what is to be the business of his life, during a considerable portion of his academical career; sacredly observing, however, the restrictions and limitations already laid down. Unless a student be thus practically initiated into his duties before he leaves college, we can easily conceive that an unbroken pursuit of science and literature, even though they may be *theological*, will, to a certain extent, produce the effects complained of, and unfavorably affect his style of public address, at least for some years, after he has entered the ministry.

It is also freely admitted, that, to a certain extent, a young man's first sermons will be undesirably tinged with the studies in which he has been recently much engaged; this is naturally and necessarily the case, whether his training has been long or short. Hence there will sometimes be a little bit of metaphysics, or a little scrap of criticism, which is totally unfit for a public audience, which had a thousand times better be dispensed with, and which, after a little experience, he would never think of introducing. This flows from two causes, the second of which is by far the more powerful of the two. First, his own mind has been recently much occupied with these things, and he mistakenly thinks that matters which are so interesting to him, must needs be interesting to every body else. Secondly, he stands a little *in need of time and experience*, the want of which is not the fault of college-training, any more than it is possible that a college-training should ever supply it. To this sort of learning, as to the mathematics, there is no 'royal road,' and patience is the only remedy. God himself has ordained that it should be so, and it never can be otherwise while the human mind takes its present course of development, or until youth and gray locks go together. The student has not yet learned that certain acquisitions are valuable only as they are instrumental in forming his own mind, and teaching him to use its faculties with facility and address on those subjects which are likely to interest and benefit a common audience; that, if for instance, he has studied metaphysics, or mathematics, he is never, as a public speaker, to let it appear that he has done either, except *indirectly*, in the greater soundness of his reasoning and perspicuity of his statements. Now, though this lesson ought to be incessantly inculcated upon him while he is a student, though he may admit its truth and importance, and even strive conscientiously to reduce it to practice, yet a little experience is absolutely necessary to enable him fully to appreciate its value. He is igno-

rant as yet in a great measure, of the topics and of the style which tell most upon human nature, and which most readily reach the understanding and the heart. In his first attempts at preaching he is unconsciously endeavouring to reduce to practice what he has as yet only learnt in theory, and we know that all such attempts whatsoever, even in things very much less difficult than preaching, are extremely awkward. It is evident, therefore, that a prolonged education is not to blame for all this—it is youth and inexperience which are the sole causes of it. The deficiencies arising from these are to be corrected only by time—by the methods which divine wisdom has appointed; and they who think it can be otherwise, are absurdly expecting to see old men's heads on young men's shoulders. We are far from denying that in many cases, notwithstanding the most judicious training, a lurking feeling of almost unconscious vanity, even in a youth who conscientiously strives to do his best, will lead to an occasional display of knowledge or of learning. But a little knowledge of human nature—a little practical acquaintance with what most interests it, with the sort of subjects and the sort of style to which the heart of man most readily responds, soon corrects all this; and thus while the benefits of protracted discipline and comprehensive knowledge are permanent, the ill effects are transitory, and soon disappear.

The same causes will account, not only for the ill-judged topics on which a youth will often descant, but for the insufficient manner in which he treats those subjects which can alone stir any deep emotion in the minds of his audience. Such defects are most preposterously charged upon his education; they are defects inseparable from youth, and necessarily spring from a partial sympathy with all the deeper feelings of humanity, with its sorrows, trials, and temptations; they are defects which no learning ever occasioned, and which no teaching can ever supply. A little time and a little experience are the only effectual tutors. And the proof is found in this: that if we take a youth, whose slender attainments and deficient training proclaim that he has been effectually exempted from the dangers which too prolonged an education is supposed to involve, we shall still see in his first addresses (though they may, perhaps, be more florid and declamatory), the same want of practical acquaintance with human nature, depth of feeling, earnest simplicity, and directness and pungency of style; in a word, of the qualities which will ever characterize the discourses of a man, whether in public or private, who vividly sympathizes in all the emotions of those whom he addresses, and is wholly absorbed in the importance of what he is delivering. It is simply another variety of the very same thing.

Nothing can in our judgment be more preposterous, or even more uncharitable or inhuman, than the criticisms which Chris-

tians, whose age, whose knowledge of human nature in general, and whose recollections of their own youthful history in particular, ought to have taught them better, often take upon them to pass upon the first efforts of a youthful preacher. The young man of four and twenty, who has never known what sorrow meant, who has never lost a friend, who has never been in adversity, who has seldom had his sympathies exercised by frequently coming into contact with those who have, who has never been subjected to severe temptations and to the discipline of sickness, and who is an absolute stranger to many of those emotions which can only be awakened in after years, gets up to preach; and an aged hearer perchance gravely tells us afterwards, 'that there was no deep experience in it; that there were too many hard words; references to and speculations about subjects in which the heart of man and the heart of a Christian can take little or no interest; and that this comes of studying at college.' We ask, How can the same or similar faults be avoided, whether the youth ever went to college or not? How much better would it become such a critic, instead of sourly dwelling on whatever has displeased him, and aggravating and multiplying the inevitable deficiencies of youth, to throw over them the mantle of charity, to rejoice in every indication which promised future excellence and usefulness, to be contented to bear with those faults which he himself would have exemplified at the same age, and to wait with patience for that ripe autumnal fruit which it is absurd to expect with the first blossoms of the spring.

Similar observations apply to those vices of style and diction which a protracted training, so far from occasioning, has a direct tendency to correct, but which yet, in spite of it, very generally characterizes the compositions of the young speaker and the young writer. Sometimes he is affectedly elegant, or ornately polished; sometimes he is all glitter and ornament, which he mistakes for the beautiful; sometimes sinks into downright fustian and bombast, which he mistakes for the sublime; one youth is proud of hard words, and another is taken with fine ones. But in all, there is more or less the want of that simple, direct, *hard-hitting* style, which will ever distinguish the productions of a mature intellect, animated by deep emotion. Such defects, in one form or other, and, to a greater or less extent, unavoidably attend a certain period of life — a period of unripe judgment, of immature taste, of undeveloped feeling. That period may be longer or shorter in different minds; abridged or protracted according to its constitutional peculiarities, or the kind and degree of culture which has been bestowed upon it; but it will exist in all; nor is there one of us, who has arrived at riper years, who cannot very well recollect that he was once well-pleased, perhaps in raptures, with what now inspires only disgust; that he once thought things very *fine*

which he would now throw aside as tawdry frippery. Now we contend, and indeed it is pretty generally admitted, that these defects, the result primarily of the constitution of human nature, so far from being cherished by a protracted education, are in every point of view likely to be diminished by it. It cannot be that the continued inculcation of simplicity, severe criticisms on the faults now animadverted upon, and familiarity with the best models, can increase the very faults which it is the perpetual effort of the teacher to detect and expose. Moreover, the mere time thus allowed for growth of intellect and expansion of feeling, has an obvious tendency to correct such faults. In fact, so far from its being true that these faults are to be attributed to an enlarged education, it is obvious that they exist in spite of it, and would exist to a greater extent, and for a longer period without it. But because, for the reasons already specified, it cannot wholly correct these faults, it is falsely charged with producing them. It is not very easy to show the absurdity of this reasoning by adducing instances of youths attempting to declaim in public without any discipline at all, because few ever attempt it; but we can truly say, that the faults now in question have always been greater in proportion to the want of it; and that the most perfect specimens of fustian and bombast to which we ever listened, were from men who had never passed through any such discipline.

We must not dismiss this important subject of our colleges, without offering two or three observations on the claims they have upon the support of our denominations, and the methods by which their revenues may be increased. Though we believe much more may be done than has yet been done, we rejoice to say that the state of our colleges is in this respect matter of congratulation. It were invidious to mention names, or dwell upon individual acts of munificence; suffice it to say, that both in the metropolis and in the country, there has been felt within the last twenty years a decidedly greater interest in these institutions, and a more generous liberality exercised in their support. We shall content ourselves with stating two or three simple facts. Upon examining the last reports of two of our largest and most respectable metropolitan colleges, we observe that the donations and bequests, within the last fifteen years, have been to those within the previous fifteen years, nearly as three to one; within the last twenty years, new and extensive buildings have been erected,* in not less than four instances, for the purpose of securing increased accommodation for students, or greater appliances of learning; while it is well known, that by an act of almost princely munificence, an entirely new college has been established in the midland counties, and that at

* Highbury, Homerton, Coward College, Airedale.

Manchester the foundations of another have just been laid, which is to cost not less than £20,000. Still we cannot help thinking, that by properly urging the claims of such institutions upon our denominations, far more may yet be effected. Indeed, when we reflect that upon these institutions the character of the rising ministry depends, that from these a supply at once permanent and effective must be secured—that it is the object of every church not only to support its own minister, but to perpetuate the ministry, we scarcely think that our congregations have as yet been roused to a due sense of what is required of them. We think that in every congregation of any considerable magnitude or wealth, there should be an annual collection for this object. Surely these institutions have as strong a claim upon our contributions, as very many others which are far more frequently put forward. Now there are many congregations that *never* have any collection for this object, and very few indeed that make it annual.—But besides these occasional collections for the purpose of gathering up the smaller fragments of public beneficence, we think that every man of competence should subscribe his guinea a year to one or other of these institutions, as regularly as he subscribes to the Bible or Missionary Societies. Men of large wealth should either subscribe a much larger sum to *one*, or what would perhaps be still better, divide their benevolence amongst them all. For about four or five guineas a year, an opulent Congregationalist or Baptist might have the satisfaction of feeling that he was doing something to support all the principal theological colleges of his own denomination.

We would also call attention to another mode by which the efficiency of these Institutions might be greatly promoted, and which we feel convinced it is only necessary to urge upon our wealthy members and wealthy churches, to induce some of them to act upon it. It is that of founding scholarships in connexion with these Institutions, for the support of a student for the ministry during the term of his academical studies. In the case of wealthy individuals this might be effected by either giving or bequeathing a sum, the annual interest of which should pay for the board and lodging of one student; and in the case of churches, by either collecting such a sum at once, and investing it in some suitable manner, or, which in the majority of cases would be easier, by raising five-and-twenty pounds a year for this specific object. These scholarships might of course be called by the name of the individuals or the churches founding them. In a new College in the midland counties, two or three such scholarships have already been founded, and it is in contemplation to found more. For ourselves, we cannot conceive a more delightful subject of reflection than that of having provided for the preparation of a perpetual succession of useful and efficient ministers; nor would it be the least advantage of such a plan

that it would bring more strongly before the churches who might adopt it, the claims of such institutions; it would surely stimulate their zeal, and animate their prayers.

It may not be uninteresting to give a statistical account of the number of the students which the Colleges of the Evangelical Dissenters are capable of accomodating, as at present constituted. It is about 350. Homerton can accommodate 20; Highbury 40; Stepney 26; Coward College 20; Spring Hill College 34; Bristol 30; Hackney 12; Airedale 20; Rotherham 20; Bradford 25; Western Academy 10; Lancashire Independent College 15; Newport Pagnell 8; Brecon 10; Pontypool 10; Glasgow Theological Academy 28; Dublin Theological Institution 6; Cheshunt (the Countess of Huntingdon's), 20.

Before we close this article we must make a few observations on a method by which it has been sometimes supposed (we are convinced erroneously) that the funds of these Institutions might be made to go much further than they do. It is sometimes said that wherever there is an extensive apparatus of education set up, and tutors, libraries, &c., provided, we might just as well educate one hundred students as thirty or forty. Tutors, it is said, might just as well lecture to many as to few. Certainly, just as well, and it would be much more pleasant. But, in the first place, these many must be fed and lodged, and this in a large establishment, is the principal source of expense. One hundred cannot live upon the food of twenty, unless the fasts be very frequent, and they take it into their heads to dine by turns. Nor can one hundred dwell in the same space with twenty, unless they agree to sleep five in a bed. In the next place, the task of mere lecturing is the least difficult and the least responsible part of the duties which the tutor has to perform. It is not in these Institutions as in some Universities, where the lecturer merely goes into his lecture-room and reads a course of lectures, leaving his instructions to be enforced and rendered available by private tuition; or, if there be no private tutors, leaving the student to derive benefit from the lectures or not, just as it may happen. Where the sole duty of the lecturer is to impart an hour's instruction in the lecture-room, to a class perhaps of some hundreds, he soon finds out the few who are likely to prove diligent and conscientious students, and these he takes by the hand and pushes forward. If students prove indolent, and upon being called upon once or twice, show by their ignorance and slovenliness that they are not disposed to learn, neither the limited nature of his duties, nor justice to those students who would make a better use of his instructions, will permit him to trouble himself any more about them, and they are left to be idle or not, to read or not, to listen or not, just as suits them. He is simply paid for *lecturing*, and if they refuse to be there, or while there, trifle away their time, it is no concern of his. But it is very different in our theological colleges. There the

young men are supported at the public expense, with money collected for the most sacred of all purposes ; and duty to the public, duty to the church of Christ, requires that the utmost should be made of every farthing of it. Moreover, the tutors are expected not only to *lecture*, but to *teach* ; not only to deliver instructions, but to see that those instructions have been apprehended and retained by the student. The consequence is, that a great part of his time must be spent in catechetical examinations, in repeating his statements where he finds they have been forgotten, or in explaining them where they have been misunderstood ; in framing exercises, and in correcting and revising the students' answers. He must stimulate the tardy, help on the feeble, reprove the indolent ; the distinction so universal elsewhere, of the *reading* and *non-reading men*—of the idle and diligent, must be unknown here. It is our firm conviction that no tutor can efficiently discharge such duties as these in more than his own department, to more than forty or at most fifty students. In University College, London, where, much to the credit of the professors, the duties of professor and teacher are to a great extent combined (a circumstance which perhaps more than any other has contributed to the success of their students), the labors of a professor in proportion to the numbers of the students are far more onerous than those of one at any other college ; and in the event, by no means, we trust, improbable, of a very large accession to the students there, it will not be possible for the professor to give so much time to each individual of his class.

As to whether a larger number of students might be brought together to the same spot by consolidating some of our Institutions and multiplying our tutors, giving to each a more restricted sphere of duties,—a question which has sometimes been discussed,—we shall refrain from saying a syllable, if only for the reason that for the present there is no possibility of practically entertaining it ; in all probability there never will be. Our Institutions are already established—occupy widely different localities, and have special interests in those localities. We cannot refrain also from saying that we have many doubts as to the wisdom of such a project even were it thought practicable. By being scattered over the country, they exercise a far more extensive influence, than they could possibly exert if confined to one spot : and while we should like to see each of our principal colleges favoured with the instructions of three or four efficient tutors, we do think that these would be able to teach, and to teach well, those portions of science and literature essential to the most thorough training of the Christian minister.

Here we close our remarks, and if they should lead to reflection and discussion on the part of those who are most interested in them, our efforts will be amply rewarded, let our suggestions appear ever so crude, our projects ever so visionary.

Art. II. *Physic and Physicians: a Medical Sketch-Book exhibiting the Public and Private Life of the most celebrated Medical Men of former days; with Memoirs of Eminent living London Physicians and Surgeons.* 2 Vols. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, and Co. 1839.

THE only commendation we can bestow upon these volumes is that of being a curious mélange of anecdotes respecting the art of medicine and its professors. In this point of view they may afford some entertainment, but whoever looks into them for more will be grievously disappointed. They are, indeed, a very creditable specimen of the modern art of book-making, in which authors seem determined to prove the fallacy of the old axiom, 'Ex nihilo nihil fit.' There is little judgment in the selection or distribution of the matter, no nice discrimination of character, no enlightened estimate of the professional reputation of the various eminent physicians who come under review, no historical account of medical discoveries. In fact the greater part of the details with which the volumes abound, rather respect the individuals to whom they relate *as men*, than *as physicians*. Their profession is a mere accident, and if the wit, and humour, and eccentricities of certain eminent lawyers or divines were put together and the books called 'Law and Lawyers,' or 'Divinity and Divines,' there would be just as much propriety in the title as in that of the work now before us. We must also enter our protest against the methods by which these volumes are stuffed out to their present bulk. The reflections and disquisitions, if such they may be called, are of a very meagre and superficial character, and yet, meagre and superficial as they are, are expressed with much formality and occasional magniloquence. *Videlicet*, speaking of the manners of eccentric medical men, our author thus pompously enlarges on a very common-place thought; 'It is said, that there are excesses of the *suaviter in modo*, even 'more designing and censurable than the overacting of the *fortiter in re*. Dr. Gregory marks, and forcibly condemns the double-faced and fee-seeking satyr, who blows south in the mansions of wealth, and north in the hovels of poverty; the cur who having grown rich by compliance with good manners, conceives himself indispensable to his employers, and becomes rapacious and brutal upon the strength of his reputation; and the servile and fawning sycophant, who in exceeding the established rules of good breeding towards characters, despicable in other respects, than external splendour and magnificence, forgets that his philosophy is but a name.'

Those portions of the work which relate to the history of medicine, more especially its ancient history, are very superficial,

and those which respect eminent living men are equally so. There is only one point of view in which these latter portions deserve any praise, and that is that they deal in no slander or calumny. On the contrary, our author manifests a laudable desire to conciliate the regard of this influential class of readers by bestowing upon them all the praise he can, and by withholding every particle of censure. But as to discrimination of character, or estimate of professional ability, these portraits (if we may apply to these sketchy things such a term) are utterly worthless. They are for the most part made up of a few unmeaning sentences of vague and undistinguishing eulogy, with here and there some incidents of personal history; while, as if our author were conscious of the meagreness of such '*memoirs* of eminent living 'physicians and surgeons,' the most trifling and unimportant peculiarities connected with the individual are frequently pressed into the service. Thus of Dr. Granville we are told 'that in personal appearance he resembles a foreigner, that he is 'passionately fond of music, and hardly ever omits to be present 'at her Majesty's Theatre during the season.' Of the few paragraphs which are devoted to Dr. Conquest, two of them are occupied with the important and novel information that he offered £100 for the best essay on the sin of covetousness; that the adjudicators were the Rev. Dr. Pye Smith and the Rev. Baptist Noel; that a vast number of competitors came forward; that the prize was awarded to the Rev. John Harris, who published his essay under the title of 'Mammon;' that this work has had a most extensive sale, and reached six editions. The '*memoir*' of Dr. Billing is contained in the words that 'he is of the London 'Hospital, and is well known by his valuable book on the Principles of Medicine.' Not less than seven physicians are all disposed of in rather less than one page, and about as many surgeons in another. It can hardly be said that our author had not room when we find him occupying valuable space with such grandiloquent reflections and irrelevant poetical scraps as the following on Dr. Thomas Davies.

'Dr. Davies's mind is not formed in a strongly imaginative mould. He has ambition, but not to an unreasonable degree. How true it is that one great source of the misery we often see in the medical profession, arises from our indulging too sanguine hopes of enjoyment from the blessings we expect, and too much indifference for those within our grasp. Young says,

'The present moment, like a wife, we shun;
And ne'er enjoy, because it is our own.'

This cannot be laid to the charge of the physician who forms the subject of this sketch. His ambition is gratified if he has it in his power to relieve the sufferings of his fellow men; to him, the recollection of

having been of service to others conveys a feeling which only Shakespeare can express : ' It comes over the heart as soft music does over the ear,

' Like the sweet south
That breathes upon a bank of violets.'

Even considered in that point of view in which alone these volumes inspire interest, that is, as a collection of curious and entertaining anecdotes, we cannot bestow upon them unqualified praise. That the author has read many books, consulted a great number of authorities, and brought together a great quantity of information, we readily admit, but it is equally evident that he has not taken time to select, digest, and compress what is said. Even in the anecdotes there is little attempt to separate what is apocryphal or traditional, from what is matter of authentic history; in one case we observe that the very same anecdote is told of two individuals, namely of Abernethy and Sir Richard Jebb; while the most thread-bare and oft-repeated stories, instead of being merely adverted to as well known to every body, are related with as much circumstantiality and diffuseness as if they were now given to the public for the first time. We will not be, however, so ungrateful as to deny that, considered as a collection of anecdotes and personal incidents, the volumes have afforded us some entertainment, and if these portions of them had been compressed and published in one volume of moderate size, we think we might have predicted for it a considerable sale.

Having spoken so fully and so freely of our author's faults—though neither more freely nor more fully than our convictions of what is due to critical honesty force us to do—we think it but just to furnish our readers with a few specimens of the more amusing matters which he has collected together.

In our selection of anecdotes we shall choose not always those which are the most amusing, as these have been often related before, but those which are the least hackneyed. Take the following of the celebrated Dr. Mead.

'Mead dabbled considerably in the stocks. One day prior to his visiting his patients, he received intelligence that the stocks had suddenly fallen. At this moment he was sent for, in a great hurry, to visit a lady who was represented to be very ill. Having considerable property in the funds, the news made so strong an impression upon his mind, that, whilst he was feeling the patient's pulse, he exclaimed, 'Mercy upon me, how they fall! lower! lower! lower!' The lady, in alarm flew to the bell, crying out, 'I am dying! Dr. Mead says, my pulse gets lower and lower; so that it is impossible I should live!' 'You are dreaming, Madam,' replied the physician, rousing himself from his reverie, 'Your pulse is very good, and nothing ails you: it was the stocks I was talking of.'—Vol. ii. pp. 15, 16.

‘Mead calling one day on a gentleman who had been severely afflicted with the gout, found, to his surprise, the disease gone, and the patient rejoicing on his recovery over a bottle of wine. ‘Come along, doctor,’ exclaimed the patient, ‘you are just in time to taste this bottle of Madeira; it is the first of a pipe which has just been broached.’ ‘Ah!’ replied Mead, ‘these pipes of Madeira will never do; they are the cause of all your suffering.’ ‘Well, then,’ rejoined the gay incurable, ‘fill your glass, for now we have found out the cause, the sooner we get rid of it the better.’—Ib. p. 18.

The next shall be of the late Dr. Baillie, one of the royal physicians. The last anecdote is beautiful.

‘During Baillie’s latter years, when he had retired from all but consultation practice, and had ample time to attend to each individual case, he was very deliberate, tolerant, and willing to listen to whatever was said to him by the patient; but, at an earlier period, in the hurry of great business, when his day’s work, as he used to say, amounted to sixteen hours, he was sometimes rather irritable, and betrayed a want of temper in hearing the tiresome details of an unimportant story. After listening, with torture, to a pressing account from a lady, who ailed so little that she was going to the opera that evening, he had happily escaped from the room, when he was urgently requested to step up stairs again; it was to ask whether, on her return from the opera, she might eat some oysters. ‘Yes, Madam,’ said Baillie, ‘shells and all.’—Ib. pp. 41, 42.

‘Notwithstanding Dr. Baillie’s general amiability of character, the multiplicity of his professional concerns would often betray him into an irritability of temper. He frequently came home, after a day of great fatigue, and held up his hands to his family circle, eager to welcome him home, saying, ‘Don’t speak to me;’ and then, presently, after a glass of wine, and when the transitory cloud had cleared away from his brow, with a smile of affection, he would look round him, and exclaim, ‘You may speak to me now.’—Ib. p. 43.

The following retort of the eccentric Dr. Mounsey is pretty good.

‘We are afraid of you, doctor, you come from a sick-room,’ exclaimed the *petit maitre*. ‘You often make me sick,’ replied Mounsey, ‘but never afraid.’—Vol. i. p. 57.

The anecdotes told of the eccentric Dr. Radcliffe and the equally eccentric John Abernethy, have been for the most part retailed a thousand times. The following story of the latter is, however, not quite so hackneyed as some others.

‘Of Mr. Abernethy’s independence, and strict regard to what is right, we have many examples. Among others, the following is characteristic. A certain noble personage, who at that time enjoyed a situation of great responsibility in the sister kingdom, had been waiting

for some time in the surgeon's anteroom, when seeing those who had arrived before him, successively called in, he became somewhat impatient, and sent his card in. No notice was taken of the hint ; he sent another card—another—another—and another ; still no answer. At length he gained admission in his turn ! and full of nobility and choler, he asked rather aristocratically, why he had been kept waiting so long ? 'Wh—ew ?' replied the professor, 'because you did not come sooner, to be sure.'—*Ib.* p. 105.

The following of Garth are not bad.

'Garth, one Sunday, stumbled into a Presbyterian church, to beguile a few idle moments, and seeing the parson apparently overwhelmed by the importance of the subject, he observed to a person who stood near him, 'what makes the man greet?' 'By my faith,' answered the other, 'you would, perhaps, greet too, if you were in his place, and had as little to say.' 'Come along and dine with me, my good fellow,' said Garth, 'I perceive you are too good a fellow to be here.'—*Ib.* p. 217.

'Many amusing anecdotes are recorded of this eminent poet and physician. On one occasion when he met the members of the celebrated Kit-Kat Club, he declared that he must soon be gone, having many patients to attend ; but on some excellent wine being placed on the table, and the conversation becoming interesting and animated, the doctor soon forgot his professional engagements. His friend, Sir Richard Steel, however, thought it his duty to remind the doctor of his poor patients. Garth immediately pulled out his list, upon which were fifteen names. 'It is no great matter whether I see them to night or not,' said he, 'for nine of them have such bad constitutions, that all the physicians in the world cannot save them ; and the other six have such good constitutions, that all the physicians in the world can't kill them.'—*Ib.* p. 218.

Of Dr. Walcot, the celebrated Peter Pindar, we find the following too characteristic anecdotes : all but the last, however, are tolerably well known.

'His writings were very productive. Those who condemned his satire purchased his works to laugh at his wit. An old acquaintance once remarked, when the doctor offered him his hand, that he hardly knew how to take it, he felt so angry with him for abusing the king. 'Pooh ! pooh !' said Peter, 'I bear no ill-will to his majesty—God bless him ! I believe him to be a very good man, but I must write upon characters that the world are interested in reading about, I would abuse you, but I should get nothing by it !'

'Walcot always declared that the booksellers had been cheating him publicly for years, and that at last he got the best side of them by stratagem. He had offered to sell the copyright of all his works for a life-annuity. The negotiation took place in the month of November,

and the doctor always appointed the evening for the time of meeting the booksellers. He had an habitual cough, and walking out in the evening fog increased it. When he arrived at the place of his destination he could never speak until he had taken a full glass of brandy, and then remarked, 'that it made little difference what the annuity was, as it would soon be all over with him.' They were of the same opinion. The bargain was made, 'and,' continued Peter, 'after I mixed water with my brandy, the spring came on, and I lost my cough.' This always pleased him to the end of his very lengthened life; and after he had signed the very last receipt, he observed, 'he was sure they had wished him at the devil long ago, and he should have done the same had he been in their place.'—*Ib.* p. 289, 290.

'Having called upon a bookseller in Paternoster Row to inquire after his own works, he was asked to take a glass of wine. Dr. Walcot consented to accept of a little negus, as an innocent morning beverage, when instantly was presented to him a cocoa-nut goblet, with the face of a man carved on it. 'Eh! eh!' says the doctor, 'what have we here?' 'A man's skull,' replied the bookseller; 'a poet's for what I know.' 'Nothing more likely,' rejoined the facetious doctor, 'for it is universally known that *all* booksellers drink wine from *our* skulls!'—*Ib.* p. 292.

We must close these anecdotes of the medical profession by the following of the eminent and amiable Quaker physician Dr. Fothergill.

'A Quaker apothecary meeting Dr. Fothergill, thus accosted him, 'Friend Fothergill, I intend dining with thee to-day.' 'I shall be glad to see thee,' answered the doctor, 'but pray, friend, hast thou not some joke?' 'No joke, indeed,' rejoined the apothecary, 'but a very serious matter. Thou hast attended friend Ephraim these three days, and ordered him no medicine. I cannot at this rate live in my own house, and must live in thine.' The doctor took the hint, and prescribed handsomely for the benefit of his friend Ephraim, and his friend Leech the apothecary!'—*Ib.* pp. 349, 350.

'We have already stated that charity was a predominant feature in Dr. Fothergill's character. It is stated that during the summer he retired to Lea Hall, in Cheshire. He devoted one day in every week to attendance at Middlewick, the nearest market town, and gave his gratuitous advice to the poor. He assisted the clergy not merely with his advice, but on numerous occasions, with his purse. On one occasion he was reproved by a friend for his refusal of a fee from a person who had attained a high rank in the Church. 'I had rather,' replied the doctor, 'return the fee of a gentleman whose rank I am not perfectly acquainted with, than run the risk of taking it from a man who ought, perhaps, to be the object of my bounty.'—*Vol.* ii. pp. 29, 30.

The following story told in the chapter on 'Quackery,' appears almost incredible, and yet after the extraordinary proofs we have

had and still have of human credulity on this point, we *can* believe that there have been fools weak enough to be imposed upon even by such absurdities. At all events, it is excellent satire on the knavery and impudence of 'Quacks,' and the ignorance and gullibility of their victims.

'Some time since a *soi-disant* quack doctor sold water of the pool of Bethesda, which was to cure all complaints, if taken at the time when the angel visited the parent spring, on which occasion the doctor's bottled water manifested, he said, its sympathy with the fount, by being thrown into a state of perturbation. Hundreds of fools were induced to purchase the Bethesda water, and watched for the commotion and the consequence, with the result to be expected. At last one, less patient than the rest, went to the quack, and complained that though he had kept his eye constantly on the water for a whole year, he had never yet discovered any thing like the signs of an angel in his bottle.

'That's extremely strange,' exclaimed the doctor, 'what sized bottle did you buy, Sir?'

'Patient. 'A half-guinea one, doctor.'

'Doctor. 'Oh, that accounts for it. The half-guinea bottles contain so small a quantity of the invaluable Bethesda water, that the agitation is scarcely perceptible; but if you buy a five guinea bottle, and watch it well, you will in due time, see the commotion quite plainly, sympathizing with that of the pool when visited by the angel.' The patient bought the five guinea bottle as advised, and kept a sharp look out for the angel until the day of his death.'

—Vol. i. pp. 327, 328.

Upon the whole, it will be seen that we are very far from being able to approve of these volumes, and that we cannot altogether condemn them. There is much in them to amuse, but little to instruct. They may be taken up to while away an idle hour, but this is the best that can be said of them.

Art. III. 1. *The Voluntary System, a Prize Essay, in reply to the Lectures of Dr. Chalmers on Church Establishments*, By JOSEPH ANGUS, M.A. London: Jackson and Walford.

2. *National Establishments of Religion, considered in connexion with Justice, Christianity, and Human Nature*. By JOHN TAYLOR. London: Smallfield and Son.

WE confess that we have no sympathy with those weak-hearted well-meaning christians who deprecate controversy. We are indebted to it for our first and greatest reformation; and we

doubt not, ere many years pass away that it will produce another and a greater still : the Reformation from Popery was a noble achievement ; the Reformation from Protestant Popery, and the entire severance of all our churches from the mother of harlots, will be the consummation of our religious freedom, and will accelerate, if not introduce, the millennium of knowledge, holiness, and love. Controversy, even when it has been most abused, has ended in the clearer manifestation and ultimate triumph of right principles. In the beautiful language of Bishop Horne, 'all objections when considered and answered, turn out to the advantage of the gospel, which resembles a fine country in the spring season, when the very hedges are in bloom, and every thorn produces a flower.'

In reviewing the controversy on Church Establishments so far as it has yet proceeded, with Dr. Chalmers leading the van on the one side, and Dr. Wardlaw on the other, we cannot help exclaiming 'surely there is no enchantment' against the Voluntaries, 'there is no divination' against the churches that receive Christ as their sole sovereign and head. The Christian Influence Society may well reproach the mighty wizard they brought not 'from the mountains of the east,' but from the far north, with having altogether defeated their intention in sending for him, and may address him in the language of Balak to Balaam, 'what hast thou done unto me, I took thee to curse mine enemies, and behold thou hast blessed them altogether.' It is even so : the redoubtable champion of worldly incorporations of religion called Established and National churches, has failed in his defence of them while he has strengthened and confirmed the principles of their opponents. To his high church patrons and supporters these Lectures of Dr. Chalmers must be as wormwood and gall. However the rhetorician's sophistry and the orator's finesse might have imposed on them as his *audience*, now that they can sit down in their individual capacity as his *readers*, they must feel that their cause has been damaged, if not betrayed, and that in provoking discussion they have only prepared the way for defeat.

In taking a retrospect of the manner in which this controversy was introduced by his patrons, and conducted on the part of Dr. Chalmers, at the Hanover Rooms, and the contrast in all respects exhibited on the part of Dr. Wardlaw and his friends at the Freemason's Hall ; we are struck with certain peculiarities which mark conscious weakness on the one side, and a calm persuasion of victory on the other. It was a spectacle for the Voluntaries to gaze upon with equal surprise and satisfaction, when a Christian Influence Society, composed of Episcopalians of the Anglican, and in their own view, the only truly Apostolic Church upon earth, sat listening to the minister of another

church merely as an unaccredited Layman, and that minister even more than virtually pledged to support Presbyterianism in opposition to 'black prelacy' joining in their Liturgy, and making common cause with them against the principles and the progress of Religious Liberty. The Voluntaries of the north and south, in this anomalous coalition, this mutual degradation, saw only a concession made to necessity, and while they lamented the voluntary humiliation of the new Salmasius, they could not but exult in it as surely indicating the triumph of their cause,—that both parties must have been in dismal straits before the one could have condescended to ask, and the other to have rendered assistance, on terms which the fathers of the Scottish Presbytery would have disdained to accept; applauded by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, but excluded from their pulpits as officially unqualified to minister at their altars. The *situation* of Dr. Chalmers, in the feelings of his friends at least, was any thing but enviable. But even this, degrading as it may appear, was as nothing when compared with the prostitution of his fine talents to the low arts and shifts of the mere professional advocate, and his total forgetfulness of the courtesies and decencies which ought never to be conspicuously violated, especially in controversies which christians of different communions may be called upon to maintain with each other. On this occasion, as it appeared to us, Dr. Chalmers exhibited more of the sophist than the saint, a character totally at variance with the simplicity which ought to adorn every follower of Him who knew no sin, and in whose mouth there was no guile.

Dr. Chalmers's method of conducting his cause was another indication of its final discomfiture. When he described the Voluntaries as men of drivelling and unintelligent piety, fanatical and presumptuous, disdaining all human means in accomplishing their objects, and yet employing 'sledge hammers' to break down the existing machinery of establishments; charging them with being 'frame breakers,' one moment laughing them to scorn as little better than idiots, and the next, denouncing them as Revolutionists, aiming at nothing less than the destruction of Church and State: he must not wonder that the persons he treats so uncourteously should regard his writings as further symptoms of their approaching triumph. We well remember while bearing the whole onslaught of the orator's abuse, picturing to ourselves the huge pillars that supported the temple of Dagon, and the stricken prophet in his blindness between them putting forth his last energy, and perishing in the mighty ruin. But if the lectures of Dr. Chalmers animated us with the assurance of victory, Dr. Wardlaw's more than realized our highest expectation. His eight lectures thoroughly sift the question of National Church Establishments; and when Dr. Chalmers's flimsy sophistry, bold

invective, or utopian speculations come in his way, he blows them into thin air, and this without the least apparent effort. Indeed throughout the discussion of the general question, and in establishing great principles, Dr. Wardlaw discovers a perfect knowledge and mastery of his subject; he perceives too in a moment the strong and weak points in the reasonings of his opponent, he detects and crushes a fallacy with the same ease that he would brush a fly from his ample forehead; so patient is he in investigation that he is absolutely above prejudice, and so calm in his progress, and farsighted in his views, that nothing can betray him into precipitancy. Every step he takes is in advance. He is rather a convincing than an eloquent writer. Yet he carries you along with him by his evident and earnest sincerity. You never once think of him as an advocate or declaimer. He is the propounder and exemplar of a divine philosophy, and grant to him his demand to derive all that is authoritative in the science from the Bible as the word of God, and you feel as he addresses you, that you are listening rather to an oracle than an orator. Chalmers appears the opposite of Dr. Wardlaw in all things. Talent he has of a high order; he may sometimes ascend to the elevation, but he cannot be said to dwell in the region of pure intellect. There is no man as a writer and speaker who is a greater stranger to simplicity than Dr. Chalmers. His style is a fair sample of his mind and tastes. He is for the gorgeous in every thing. He would have been a Laud in pomp, if he had not been born and bred a Presbyterian. When he ought to construct an argument, he paints a picture. He lays his premises in a fancy, and his most elaborate reasoning is but a castle in the air. Instead of a syllogism he gives you a metaphor; and for a definition you must be satisfied with an illustration. He understands the *Petitio principii*, and is always assuming what he ought to prove, and which is often contradicted by all the facts of the case. In his most felicitous moods he is a fine aurora borealis—we gaze, and are dazzled—we look again, and the splendid pageant has vanished. If imagination could have done it, instead of failing he would have triumphed over the enemies of establishments.

Having already and at some length noticed the works which have called forth these further passing observations, we must introduce to our readers two other performances which have not only assisted to keep the subject alive before the public, but which are of a superior order, and in point of talent may be placed beside the volumes of Gladstone and Maurice, while in fair, manly, and conclusive argument, they are immeasurably above them. They are both Prize Essays; Mr. Angus gaining the first prize offered by the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, for the best refutation of the pernicious

doctrines and principles disseminated by Dr. Chalmers's Lectures on Establishments ; and Mr. Taylor the second. The former of these gentlemen is known to us as a young minister of the Baptist denomination of singular promise—of the latter, we know absolutely nothing, except as the author of the work before us.

The essays however speak for themselves. It was judicious, we think, to offer more than a single prize ; and if this plan, now becoming so common, should be persevered in, we recommend the calling forth and rewarding as much talent as will promote the objects for the attainment of which it is directed ; had Mr. Taylor's essay not been published, the cause which he defends would have sustained a great loss. The same subject may be exhibited by various writers in very different lights and under peculiar aspects, and be all the better understood for this diversity of treatment. This is well illustrated in the successful writers before us. Mr. Angus triumphantly leads the way, with the Voluntary System which he supports—Mr. Taylor follows, with the argumentative demolition all National Establishments. When their principles and public opinion become identical,—and we trust the signs of the times indicate that the period is not far distant,—then will the world become their acknowledged debtors, and a nation's gratitude will await and reward their peaceful victories. Every man that values the social happiness, and the religious well-being of his species, and who can wield a pen with effect, ought to join this holy alliance in their noble efforts to drive all usurpers from the throne of the Prince of Peace. In this warfare our enemies must be Voluntaries as well as ourselves. Their citadel of compulsion will avail them nothing now ; ere long, like another Bastille, it will be battered to the ground. We must both stand or fall by the force of argument, the power of Truth.

In reviewing the leading writers on the part of ecclesiastical establishments, and those who are marshalled against them, it is impossible not to be struck with the opposite positions which the former assume, and which are fatal to each other ; and the perfect oneness and harmony of principles, whatever be their diversities of church or sect, which the latter uniformly exhibit, and by which they all and equally uphold their own system, while they battle down in detail the whole force of their adversaries ;—a force which, being composed of hostile elements, might be safely left to destroy itself, were it not for its aggressive character towards dissentients ;—the only point of combination which holds its heterogeneous and antagonist influences together. For a brief view of these, and their fatal operation upon each other, we refer our readers to our notice of Mr. Dick's Dissertation on Church Polity in a recent number. Mr. Angus, and Mr. Taylor, as well as Mr. Dick, have met the two great divisions in the church militant, which are now setting themselves in array against the

voluntary system; and whether they are sticklers for divine right or expediency, whether they serve under Hooker or Warburton, Gladstone or Chalmers, these striplings of our Israel have met them single-handed, and crushed them with weapons of stouter metal than their own; weapons of ethereal temper, taken from the armoury of Scripture, which those 'upon the adverse faction' know not how to use or to repel, and which are truly described as not 'carnal, but spiritual and mighty through God' 'to the pulling down of *the strongholds of Satan*, and the casting 'down of imaginations, and of *every high thing which exalteth itself against the knowledge of God*.'

As truth has been often obscured, and controversies perplexed and rendered interminable, by the loose manner in which words and phrases are employed, whereby the disputants have unconsciously or with design confused their own meaning and that of their opponents, furnishing in every page materials for new arguments and objections; nothing can be of greater importance at the commencement of a controversy, than a clear and precise terminology—from which neither side should be permitted to deviate, even a hairs-breadth. After exposing, in his first chapter, certain sophistical statements of the voluntary question, and in a manner so winning and attractive, that whoever takes up the volume and begins with the beginning, will feel himself drawn on imperceptibly to its close, Mr. Angus unfolds, in the second chapter, 'the real question at issue between the 'advocates of voluntaryism and a state church;' which he introduces by remarking—

'In all disputed questions, it is of the last moment that the advocates of opposite systems set down, at the very beginning, the meaning of their words and terms, or at least that they define clearly what notions each doubtful one is supposed to involve. We proceed, therefore, to describe what seem the distinctive features of the *voluntary* and state-establishment system.'—p. 21.

After clearing his ground by laying down eight distinctions, by disregarding which so much inconvenience has been hitherto experienced by writers on either side, the author proceeds to state the case—

'The question we have to investigate is this—whether the peaceful subject of a government, who conscientiously believes the religious sentiments and the religious worship of the established sect more or less unscriptural, ought to be *compelled* to support and diffuse them, and then punished, either by direct penalty or by *exclusion* from equal privileges, for his conscientious belief?

'If any insist that compulsory taxes for the support of another's faith, or injustice, and inequality of privilege for conscience-sake, or

persecution, and government aid, are not included in their notion of a national church, we can only reply, that when national churches are found without them our objections cease.'—pp. 26, 27.

The third chapter treats of the injustice of a state church, and is introduced by an admirable motto from Burke's Tracts on the Popery Laws, a mine of principles from which treasures may be dug up, which voluntaries and compulsionists, and especially the latter, little dream of. It is too good not to be transferred to our pages.

'Reason is never inconvenient but when it comes to be applied. Mere general truths interfere very little with the passions. They can, until they are roused by a troublesome application, rest in great tranquillity, side by side, with tempers and proceedings the most directly opposite to them. Men want to be reminded, who do not want to be taught; because those original ideas of rectitude to which the mind is compelled to assent when they are proposed, are not always as present to it as they ought to be. When people are gone, if not into a denial, at least into a sort of oblivion of those ideas, when they know them only as barren speculations, and not as practical motives of conduct, it will be proper to press, as well as to offer them to the understanding; and when one is attacked by prejudices, which aim to intrude themselves into the place of law, what is left for us but to vouch and call to warranty those principles of original justice from whence alone our title to every thing valuable in society is derived?'—p. 28.

This chapter begins with an objection against state churches, which involves the applicability of the doctrines of free trade to the Christianization of a country, which figure so prominently in the Lectures of Dr. Chalmers. Mr. Angus has set this question at rest. He has pointed out Dr. Chalmers's mistakes, and their origin; and has met the philosophic objection to the transference of the principles of free-trade in business to free-trade in Christianization. He admits the distinction on which the objection is founded—'That between the spiritual appetite of men 'for religious truth, and their physical appetite for the necessities 'or the luxuries of life, there is no resemblance. The want of 'food creates the appetite of hunger, and hunger seeks to be 'appeased; but ignorance creates no appetite for knowledge, no 'hungering and thirsting after truth, no spontaneous movement 'towards instruction; and therefore it is held, though the one 'appetite may be left alone to seek its own gratification, the 'other must be stimulated before it will seek to be supplied.' To this Mr. Angus thus replies:—

'The reality and the justness of this distinction no one can for a moment hesitate to allow. Christians of every name have long been familiar with the melancholy facts on which it is founded, and as

Christians have acted upon them. Unhappily, however, it proves nothing relatively to the duty of the government. It is true that because for articles of trade demand and supply may be left alone to adjust themselves, therefore government need not interfere with them; but it is by no means a necessary consequence of this principle, that because for the truths of religion demand and supply cannot safely be left alone, therefore they must be supported and diffused by the government.

‘The first argument is conclusive:—

‘Wherever demand and supply can safely be left to their own adjustment, *no one* need interfere with them.

‘But in trade they may be left to their own adjustment.

‘Therefore, *no one* need interfere with them.

‘The second argument is deceptive:—

‘Wherever demand and supply cannot safely be left to their own adjustment, *some one* must interfere with them.

‘But in religion they cannot safely be left to their adjustment.

‘Therefore, *government* must needs interfere with them.

‘The first conclusion is logically true; the second, it will be seen, is logically false: ‘no one’ certainly excludes the members of the government; while ‘some one’ of the second syllogism does not necessarily include them. To make this celebrated distinction at all available, we must adopt for the first premiss a proposition notoriously false—viz. ‘With whatever cannot well be left alone government must interfere;’ or, for the second, some proposition that takes as granted the whole question at issue between the advocates of state establishments and ourselves.’—pp. 39, 40.

By following the writer closely through his logically constructed process of reasoning, the reader will have no difficulty in arriving at his conclusions.

1. That the principles of free-trade are principles of justice.

2. That they are violated, not by the voluntary beneficence of dissenters, but certainly by the prerogatives of chartered sects. And,

3. That these prerogatives are essentially unjust.

Till, therefore, injustice become expedient (Mic. vi. 8), ecclesiastical state-establishments must be condemned.

That the advocates of compulsory payments to ecclesiastical establishments, or for ecclesiastical purposes, may be left without the fragment of an argument with which to defend their injustice, Mr. Angus drives them from their pretended scriptural authorities drawn from the history of Jewish and patriarchal times; and especially exposes the fallacy of their claim founded in Levit. xxvii. 30, ‘All the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord’s, holy unto the Lord.’ The value of the following extract must atone for its length.

‘But mark the following facts:—

- ‘1. All tithes paid under the law were polluted, till a tenth of them had been presented as a heave-offering (Numb. xviii. 28, 32); and hence the Jews regard this law as obsolete, since there is no priest, no temple, no altar, to hallow them.

Is this custom continued, or is it practicable? If not, tithes are unsanctified, ‘there is sin upon them.’

- ‘2. All tithes were paid under the law, as part of the inheritance of the Levites. They that had tithes had no land, and were forbidden to hold it.

Can such a restriction be pleaded in defence of the tithes of the English church?

- ‘3. The annual tithes were shared by the offerers of them (Deut. xiv. 23). The triennial tithes by the Levite, the offerer, the fatherless, the stranger, and the widow (verses 28, 29).

Are the tithe-gatherers of this country prepared to allow this appropriation of the ‘gifts’ of the people?

‘If, therefore, the tithes of Canaan were polluted till *ceremonially* sanctified,—if the right of them belonged to the tribe of Levi in particular, and in compensation of the twelfth of the land of promise,—and not to them only, but also to the owner and his household at the time of their offering, and every third year to the stranger and fatherless,—it follows, that ministers of this day, who acknowledge none of these conditions, can have no just title to tithes founded on the Mosaic law.

‘The examples of Abraham and of Jacob, and all arguments drawn from them, are equally impertinent; they are, in truth, so preposterous, that nothing less than a bad cause could have induced good men to support them. Jacob vowed and *voluntarily* offered, not to a priest, but directly to God. Till, therefore, a voluntary gift to the Almighty and a compulsory payment to man are shown to be perfectly analogous, this case must be confessed to be altogether beside the point in dispute.

‘But the example of Abraham,’ it will be replied, ‘you must allow to be conclusive.’ By no means; for observe—1. Not examples, but express precepts, are to regulate the actions of the Christian. 2. The Holy Spirit does not even commend his conduct: it is merely stated, that the representative of the Levites honored the representative of Christ (Heb. vii.), thereby proving that *his* priesthood is greater than *theirs*. 3. This tithe was a voluntary offering of respect, not of reward, from one who was a priest and the representative of priests, to one who was both priest and king, and therefore the representative of the Saviour. 4. Melchizedec had previously bestowed presents upon Abraham; he had given him provision enough to refresh his whole army, and, as an expression of reverence, Abraham honored him with a tenth of the *spoils*. First, let all these facts be proved to correspond to facts connected with the present system; let it be shown that voluntary homage and compulsory maintenance are one,—that what Abraham did is to be done now,—that because a *priest* paid tithes to one who was both priest and king, therefore the *people* must pay them to

one who is a priest only ; and then, unless it be possible to enumerate points of difference as important as those we have now given, we shall be ready to allow some authority to the example.

‘ But the scribes and pharisees paid them,’ it will be added ; and in so doing they had the approbation of our Master. ‘ These ought ye to have done’ (Matt. xxiii. 23). Doubtless, for the law was not yet abrogated ; its precepts therefore were still binding. Besides, even though it were right that the chief teachers of the people should *pay* tithes previous to the destruction of the temple, it will be difficult to prove, from their example, that therefore now they ought to *receive* them. To *take* tenths and to *pay* tenths are phrases scarcely synonymous.

‘ 16. To our own mind there is something eminently impious in these attempts to lay to the ‘ fatherhood of God’ the iniquities and injustice of this system. To seize the last means of subsistence from the poor, whose claims to a part of the tithes of the country, founded either on the Mosaic or on old English law, are to the full as just as those of the church ; to sue and imprison ; to take priestly dues, like the sons of Eli, ‘ by force,’ and all for the support of a religious faith which the sufferer believes the Bible has condemned, are practices in themselves sufficiently awful : but that they all should be perpetrated under the color of divine authority, and sanctioned by certain pretences to divine right, is to copy too closely the example of the servant of the prophet (2 Kings v. 22), to take God’s name, not in vain only, but in violence ; to commit sacrilege of the foulest kind ; to prostitute the religion of peace to the purposes of cruelty and blood. Can it be a matter of surprise, that the ‘ offering of the Lord is abhorred’ (1 Sam. ii. 12, &c.), or that the Protestant church is but hardly able to keep her ground against the encroachments of Rome ? The truth is, that she is ‘ smitten ;’ her form, though not wholly destitute of life, is deathlike and powerless ; and our fear is, that, unless her exactions speedily cease, she may be driven out from the ‘ presence of our Master,’ and ‘ the leprosy’ be commanded to ‘ cleave unto her and her seed even for ever.’

‘ 17. And while it is thus impossible to defend this iniquitous system from the books of the Old Testament, it is equally impossible to find even the semblance of an argument on its behalf in the commands or the spirit of the New ; it is, on the contrary, expressly condemned as eminently inconsistent with equity and divine precept.’ pp. 43—48.

For the argument we must refer to the book. ‘ The persecution involved in the existence of a state church,’ which is the subject of the fourth chapter, is well discussed.

How just are the following remarks.

‘ The liberty of toleration ! Was ever heard so gross a contradiction of terms ? Toleration is a mitigation of punishment, not a definition of liberty ; and when that punishment is inflicted for conscientious views, the mitigation of it deserves no other thanks than are due to moderate persecution ; and even these must be given, not to the

church, but to the people and the state. The working of the system may be lenient, but the system itself is unchanged. It is now what it has ever been; it retains the same offices, principles, and canons, and refuses to alter or repeal them. The toleration of Dissenters is the proof of its weakness, not of its love.'—p. 53.

The subtle and malignant working of persecution the author has traced with great acuteness, and shows that its spirit inheres in every secular establishment. This he practically illustrates in our own. We have already quoted so much, and there are so many admirable passages in this chapter, that we must refer our readers to it, merely presenting them with the syllabus. In the list of contents it stands thus.

'Persecution, or the infliction of penalties for the conscientious profession of faith, and toleration, or *mitigated persecution*, defined.—Sinfulness of both.—*First* class of penalties involved in establishments :—Exclusion from the wealth and privileges of the endowed sect.—*Second* class of penalties :—Loss of influence, of character, and of consequent usefulness, on the part of the unendowed.—Pleas in defence of such penalties examined.—Influence of this system on the GOVERNMENT.—On the liberties of the people.—On the stability of the ruling power.—Influence of the system on the CHURCH.—On its unity.—On its spirituality.—On its success.—Pleas in defence of the continuance of the system examined.—The system shown to be inconsistent with—1. The example of Christ; 2. The peculiar sanctions and penalties of religion; 3. The nature of religion as a service of voluntary devotedness; 4. The fundamental principle of Christ's reign, which forbids the aid of the civil power.'—pp. viii., ix.

The fifth chapter treats of the office and duties of the civil ruler, which Mr. Angus thus concludes, and the quotation unfolds the course of the whole argument.

'In reply, then, to the argument of the advocate of state churches,—that it is the duty of a Christian government to compel its subjects, or any portion of them, to support and diffuse what they do not believe,—it is merely asked, on what law is this duty founded? On the law of the just, or of the expedient, or of the scriptural,—laws essentially consistent, and fancied at variance only through the imperfection of our moral or intellectual faculties? Nature is against it; reason and prudence are against it; the precepts and example of the New Testament are against it. The clear and unanimous decision of them all is, that with religion the magistrate, as such, and in the exercise of the power with which as a magistrate he is invested, has no right to interfere. The regulation of the conduct of the subject is within his province; the regulation of the faith of his subject, founded, as it ever must be, on injustice and persecution, is beyond it.'—p. 177.

The last chapter contains a valuable summary of all the theo-

ries of ecclesiastical establishments which have obtained and which have passed under the author's review. In it he likewise shows that voluntaryism does not imply that religion is not of national importance, but only that there must be no compulsion in diffusing it. Its principles are illustrated, its sufficiency maintained, objections to it are answered, and its prospects unfolded. There is one palpable hit which we are tempted to give and we have never been more tempted to transgress our limits than on the present occasion, but this *shall* suffice.

‘ Voluntaryism has not yet evangelized the people, and therefore it cannot evangelize them, is no conclusive reasoning ; much less conclusive than the following,—the established church has not yet evangelized the people, and therefore *it* cannot evangelize them ; much less conclusive, because she has had longer time to do it, and because whatever has been done by dissent has been done, for the most part, in spite of the church, while all that has been done by the church has been done with the help and co-operation of Dissenters. And besides (2), even if voluntaryism cannot diffuse religion, it can never thence be proved that therefore the government ought to diffuse it, unless it be first shown, that to diffuse it is essential to the existence of civil society, or that the postponement of the primary ends of government to the secondary, and the introduction of distinctions that involve injustice and persecution, are consistent with the precepts of Scripture and the conclusions of a comprehensive and enlightened experience. From what has been said in preceding chapters it will be seen that this cannot be shown. The endowment of religion is not essential to the being of a government, and therefore no reasons of necessity can be urged in its behalf ; nor is it essential to its well-being ; but, on the contrary, injures alike the commonwealth and the church, making the one suspected, secular, feeble, and, by its injustice, alienating the minds of the subject from the laws and constitution of the other. So that, were it true that voluntaryism is incompetent to secure the ends for which God designed it,—were the history of the primitive church, and of the universal diffusion of the gospel in early ages without an establishment, a pure fiction,—and the success of the same principle in America even more questioned than it is,—still the present system, which makes men hostile to the government without making them friendly to religion, must be earnestly and justly condemned.’

—pp. 187, 188.

The notes and illustrations are very happily selected, and confirm the argument, which had they been inserted in the body of the work might have encumbered it.

Mr. Taylor's essay takes a different route to that of his predecessor, but arrives at the same conclusions. There is sufficient difference between the two to prove the writer of each to be an independent thinker. We have read them with equal satisfaction, and yet we should undoubtedly have concurred with the

adjudicators in their award to each. Mr. Angus undertook a higher task than Mr. Taylor, and has handled topics of great importance with the power of a master, which did not come within the scope of Mr. Taylor's design. The plan embraces seven chapters, and a copious appendix of illustrative notes. The following are the subjects, which are discussed with great ability.

'Whether the idea of civil government involves a right to legislate upon matters of religion?

'Whether civil interference with religion is sanctioned or permitted by Christianity?

'The idea of an established church.

'The tendency of ecclesiastical establishments.

'The actual operation of religious establishments.

'The supposed efficiency of the territorial distribution of an establishment.

'The voluntary principle and its results.'

We think Mr. Taylor peculiarly happy in his reply to Dr. Chalmers on the subject of free trade as applied in its principles to the propagation of the gospel, and should have been glad to quote this portion of his concluding chapter, but our space forbids.

There are two persons of eminence—Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Gladstone—to whom we earnestly recommend the perusal of these volumes, and whom we challenge to the task of answering them. The occupation is every way worthy of their acknowledged talents, and we respectfully and in all seriousness invite them to undertake it. Let the 'great argument' be discussed in a Christian temper and with a supreme regard to the authority of God's holy word, and we care not what strength of intellect or depth of erudition be arrayed on behalf of our opponents. Time may be required for the working out of our principles into the practical faith of our countrymen, but we have no fear of the issue, and can calmly await its arrival.

Art. IV. *Antipopopriestian: or, an Attempt to liberate and purify Christianity from Popery, Politikirkality, and Priestrule.* By JOHN ROGERS. Vol. I. Popery. London. 8vo., pp. 362.

IN most cases it is a matter of less difficulty to bring men to the approval of a good purpose, than to bring them into a cordial agreement with regard to the best means of prosecuting it. The end is generally much more simple than the means; and to diminish complexity, is to lessen the occasion for those differences which are ever arising from diversities of taste,

capacity, and culture. Little mischief, however, would arise from this source, compared with what is now found to result from it, if men could learn to divest themselves of a certain notion of infallibility which is always more or less connecting itself with their own conceptions on the points in dispute. All admit, in general terms, the wisdom of endeavouring to adapt instruction to the peculiar mental habits of the instructed; but each, at the same time, is prone to regard that mode of teaching as intrinsically the best, which is found to be best adapted to his own particular aptitudes and tastes. The ministry of reconciliation has been committed to 'sons of thunder,' and to 'sons of consolation;' but it rarely happens that those who hang with devout interest on the lips of the one of these classes of teachers, are sufficiently aware that the utterances of the other are the work of the same inspiration, and adapted to the same end. No man needs be told that the varieties in human character are almost endless, but from this fact it must follow that the gospel would not be well administered if it were not expounded and applied in a manner embracing a corresponding diversity of adaptation. The preaching of Paul, of Apollos, and of Cephas, had their respective characteristics, but all were good, each having its fitness to move both the intellect and the heart in the instance of the classes to whose condition of mind their own consecrated powers had been wisely adjusted. The earth sends forth its abundance, not as the effect of any one influence, but as the result of sunshine and showers, of cold and heat; and the processes of the moral and spiritual world are carried on by a similar variety of means.

These thoughts have been suggested by the book before us. It is not in many respects a book to our taste; it embraces, nevertheless, much that is valuable, and the very parts which we might be disposed to note as faults, may occur to others as excellencies, and be the means of attracting attention to the subject, and of awakening interest about it. The preface or introduction alone is a curiosity. It extends to nearly sixty pages, and touches upon something like that number of different subjects. Popery, the churches of England and Ireland, Wesleyanism, Owenism, Simonianism, Infidelity, Atheism, all come in for their share of our author's criticism and rebuke. With these discourses we have also much about the author himself—his judgment of his own religious character, his ideas concerning the utility of his work, his determination not to 'mince the matter,' his solicitude, at the same time, to avoid giving unnecessary pain, his description of a good wife, concluding with an account of his 'friend * * * *' the author of a new chemical theory, but one which from the want of its being adequately tested, cannot be said to be either right or wrong. How this budget of matters

got into the sequence which has befallen them, may be obvious enough to the author, but will not, we suspect, be quite clear to his readers. Then, in addition to all this, is the title of the work. Look at it, good reader, and tell us, if you can, to what country, or what age, the author can belong?

But strange to say, with all these oddities, meeting you at the gate and in the vestibule, there is enough in the material and structure of the work to constitute it really a good one. The aim of the author is not to go into the historical, or even into the scriptural department of the popish controversy, so much as to examine the various assumptions of the papal system, considered as matters exposed to the scrutiny of reason. We cannot pretend to be satisfied with all that he has said within these limits, nor with his manner of saying it; but there is an iteration and earnestness in the man, and withal a measure of clearness and force of conception, which we believe will fit him for usefulness in the kind of labour on which he has entered. If this should be the case, we shall not be disposed to quarrel with his quaint style, or even with his new words, for we are not disposed to attribute these to affectation so much as to a simple honest wish to do his work well—to strike the nail home. We have no reason to think that Mr. Rogers is particularly versed in the controversial pieces which belong to the history of our theology during the commonwealth, but his work has all the characteristics of that period, good and bad, with one exception only—its enlightened spirit of toleration. His sentences seem to come down like the blows at Marston Moor and Naseby. There is that sort of heartiness in them which never fails to interest; and like the true Cromwellian soldier, he not only does not understand what it is to be beaten, but seems to be incapable of thinking that he has done quite enough even when his victory is complete.

We trust that we have already said enough to induce many of our readers to possess themselves of this singular volume; but we must now add a few extracts in illustration of our remarks. The work consists of two chapters, the one on 'popery in general,' and the other on 'popery in special.' Each of these chapters is divided into a number of sections and sub-sections; and it is due to the author to add, that in the body of the work there is nothing of the rambling style which pervades the Introduction. There is a distinctness in all the parts, and a consecutiveness in the whole. The following passage exhibits something of the manner in which the writer exposes the difficulties attendant on the popish doctrine, which makes the seat of infallibility to be in a general council.

'What is a general council? 1. How many men must come together to form one? 2. What clerical rank must they severally have? 3. From how many nations must they come? 4. By whose authority must they meet? 5. When and where must they meet? 6. How

must they proceed when met? 7. Must they determine by unanimity, or may they determine by a given large majority, or by a mere majority of one? 8. What degree of probability must they require a proposition to have? Probability can be great, can be middle, can be small, can ascend to certainty, can descend to doubt. How probable must a proposition be? Now afore we can decide if a given council be what many papal folk are pleased to call a general one, we must answer the foregoing eight questions, and others that might be mentioned. This would be found no trifling task, the answering of all the questions being a very puzzling and perplexing affair. A general council is a very vague and indefinite thing, for what is the criterion or standard of this generality? Of four people two might consider a given council general, and two might deem it special, the generality and speciality being perhaps equally probable. This kind of generality is a thing whereabout A may believe, B may disbelieve, and C may doubt. Can papal writers lay down rules that will enable reasonable people clearly to know the exact essence or real nature of generality and speciality in relation to councils; to know alway when a council is general and when it is special? I trow not, I opine that they cannot. The generality of a council depends on no immutable criterion—is determined by no indisputable or indubitable rule, but varies with the various opinions of various people, altering the shape like a Proteus, and changing the color as a chameleon. Moreover, mankind are far from being agreed in relation to the number of general councils that have been held. Some will have six councils to be general, others will have seven, others eight, others eighteen, and others more. The main body of papal folk affirm eighteen to be general; eight eastern called by the emperors, and ten western called by the popes. But if all these are to be deemed general why are those of Constance and the like to be deemed special?—pp. 113, 114.

From this maze of difficulties there an important practical inference clearly deducible, the justice of which is worked out in the following passage with good effect.

‘Now is it probable that infallibility is joined to so indefinite and indeterminate a thing as a general council, a thing with difficulty recognized. A thing that can hardly be known; is joined to some kind of council, we hardly know what? Would God put infallibility in a place where we should have great toil and trouble in finding it, and where many would not find it at all, would never believe it to be? Would he annex it to mere indefinitude? If infallibility be given to the world, it is given for the world’s good. What the better are we, however, by knowing that infallibility is somewhere, but where we do not know; that it belongs to something, to a general council; but to what thing, to what council, we cannot tell? We may as well doubt or disbelieve that infallibility pertains to a general council, as, believing it, doubt or disbelieve, that a council is general. We are as far from infallibility in the latter way, as in the former. And God will not send infallibility in a form visible to very many people; He

will not make her dwell with a personage whose dwelling can hardly be discovered, can scarcely be known by a large portion of mankind. God will not give infallibility to some councils, and omit to tell man what councils they are, telling him that they are general ones, and leaving him in doubt and darkness as to what councils ought to be deemed general. It follows that papites greatly err, and leave the probable far behind them, in making infallibility depend on general councils.'—pp. 114, 115.

The third section of the second chapter relates to the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition. On the anti-scriptural tendency of the Romish doctrine concerning Tradition, Mr. Rogers makes the following just and forcible observations :—

‘ Setting up oral tradition as a rule of faith, is lowering and degrading the Bible, and leads to practical disregard to the written word. I may however be told that if there be apostolical tradition or unwritten revelation, the Bible ought not to have the whole of our reverential homage or religious regard, but that the written and unwritten revelation ought to share the homage or regard between them. And I may be told that if there were apostolical tradition, the Bible would receive its proportional and due share of our attention. I however affirm that if there were the unwritten word, the written one would not be proportionally and duly attended to, but would be comparatively neglected and thrown aside. Tradition would then be regarded too much, and scripture too little. The foregoing would be the effect on two accounts. 1. The bare doubt or mere uncertainty about what traditions ought to be deemed apostolical, would keep the mind in a state of painful solicitude and feverish anxiety, and therefore would hold it disproportionally and unduly to tradition and from scripture. If apostolical or oral traditions did exist, they would cause so great an amount of doubting, disbelieving, and debating, of questioning and answering, denying and affirming, as to occupy the far greater part of time on oral tradition, and to leave but a very little time for the written word ; the dubious and difficult matter of tradition absorbing our time and thought to the comparative exclusion of the sure and plain realities of the Bible. If people had ground for deeming portions of divine revelation to be dwelling in the memory of man, or floating down the tide of time in the form of oral traditions, they would be led by piety and curiosity, to try and find them out ; and in hunting after unwritten and changing tradition would neglect the written and unchanging volume. Account 2. The clergy assuming to be the guardians of oral tradition, and the medium of transmitting it from age to age, would naturally, in order to augment their dignity and importance, and to maintain and extend their power over the laity or people, lay too great stress on tradition, and too little on Scripture ; would naturally, in order to exalt themselves, magnify that whereby they would be magnified, namely, tradition, and undervalue that whereby they would be rendered less important, namely, the divine scripture. The priesthood, as the channel or conveyer of oral tradition, would be tempted and drawn to honor and uphold the unwritten at the expense

of the written word, and therefore to become more wanted and influential, unduly crying up the value of the former, in order unduly to cry up their own value. Now as, on the two accounts foregoing, tradition would deprive scripture of its due part of attention, we may infer that probably no apostolical traditions were given to the kirk.'

—pp. 158, 159.

There is another extract on this subject which we had marked for insertion, and which is so racy with our author's manner that we cannot forbear introducing it.

'How utterly improbable the pure descent of tradition! How nearly impossible that the unwritten word or oral traditions would be transmitted or handed down from Christ and the apostles to us, quite uncorruptedly, or quite free from alteration, addition, or subtraction. Regard two points. 1st. How could we depend on the memory of thousands or millions of men in a great multitude of particulars? We could not depend thereon. 2nd. How could we depend on the honesty of so many men in so many matters. We could not depend thereon. Now from the foregoing two points, we learn that the very great number of individuals forming the long line of the priesthood, might easily corrupt oral tradition, corrupting in a twofold way, through want of memory and want of honesty, being defective in power and inclination, being both unable and unwilling. Hardly two men relate one and same particular alike, or tell one and same tale or anecdote without considerable variation. We may perhaps be told that no tradition ought to be received, but what would agree with the rule of Vincent of Lerins, but what would have been held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, always, every where, and by all. Many a papite often desire to appear fond of the rule, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Alas for them! May we not infer a priori or with a kind of anterior probability, that by the real application of the rule, the whole or very nearly the whole of papal traditions would be quite swept away? How many, or rather how few, papal traditions would fully come up to the foregoing rule! Now God foreknowing the result, that oral tradition would become corrupt, corrupted by men through weak memory, or weak morality, or both, did not commit a part of his revealed truth to the unsafe conveyance of oral tradition.'—pp. 161, 162.

An instructive confirmation of the remarks in these extracts is furnished in the bull of his holiness Pope Leo XII. against the Bible Society. 'You are aware, venerable brethren,' says this successor of St. Peter, 'that a certain society, called the Bible Society, strolls 'with effrontery throughout the world; which society contemning 'the traditions of the holy fathers, and contrary to the well known 'decree of the Council of Trent,* labors with all its might, and by

* Some of our readers may not be uninterested with a translation of this well-known decree. 'Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the

'every means, to translate, or rather to pervert, the Holy Bible into the vulgar languages of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages, may also occur with regard to others; to wit, 'that by a perverse interpretation, the gospel of Christ 'be turned into a human gospel, or, what is still worse, into the 'gospel of the devil.' To avert this plague, our predecessor published many ordinances, and in his latter days Pius VII. of blessed memory, sent two briefs . . . to show how noxious this most wicked novelty is to both faith and morals. We also, venerable brethren, in conformity with our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn away your flock by all means from these poisonous pastures.' When this famous bull reached Ireland, the papal prelates did not scruple to describe it as 'replete with truth and wisdom;' in short 'Peter had spoken by Leo,' and the Bible Society scriptures were 'entirely, and without any exception prohibited' to their flocks.

The extracts we have given must suffice to enable our readers to judge for themselves with regard to the character of this work. The discussions of the author concerning papal infallibility, tradition, and the forbidding of the Bible, are followed by others relating to the use of an unknown tongue, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the worship of the host, the withholding of the cup from the laity, idolatry, merit, purgatory, absolution and excommunication, auricular confession, the celibacy of the clergy, the seven sacraments, and some other matters, and on all these topics Mr. Rogers has fixed the impression of his own singular taste and cast of thinking. The controversy altogether is one on which libraries have been written. No one, accordingly, will expect to find it fully exhibited within the limits of a small octavo. Nor is there competency in Mr. Rogers to deal with the subject in any thing like the full length and breadth of it. There is both originality and force in him, within certain limits. But in regard to the historical, and the more critical departments of the subject, he would be found a sorry match, whatever the suggestion of some of his friends may have been on that point, for such men as Dr. Wiseman and the writers in the *Dublin Review*. Many of their

Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it; it is on this point referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may by the advice of the priest or the confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess them without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution, until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary !'

weak points he could detect and expose with much effect, and we shall be happy to find that the public has given him encouragement so to employ himself; but we trust that his natural shrewdness will suffice to admonish him that it will not be wise to commit himself beyond a certain line in this warfare.

Nor can we express any sort of approval of the liberties which he has taken with his mother tongue. These liberties meet you, not merely in the title-page, but throughout the book. New words, it seems, are needed at almost every step. In most quarters, the issuing of such coin will be accounted not only a species of presumption—but as a sort of literary treason. The only men entitled to the exercise of such a prerogative, are those whose genius has vested them with a kind of sovereignty; and what should be well observed by all persons who have some passion for setting up a mint of their own in this way is, that the men who have most right to a display of this high species of authority are generally the least disposed to put it into requisition. We can easily suppose that Mr. Rogers has been far from suspecting the danger to which his head has been made liable by his conduct in this particular, but a man is not the less exposed to the penalties of treason because he has meddled with so grave a matter somewhat unwittingly.

We look also with a little more scrutiny and suspicion on the volume before us, when we call to mind that it is only the first of three, the whole being so devised as to take in the entire compass of the ecclesiastical delinquency of the times. Our Mc Niel's and Mc Ghee's may enjoy the thumps which our author has given to the 'man of sin;' but let them bear in mind that their own turn will come next; and the sound nonconformist, prepared to enjoy the heavy strokes dealt out upon the 'Politikirkalians,' will do well not to forget that according to our author even nonconformity is sometimes found nourishing a sort of monster called 'priestrulë,' and that the commission of John Rogers extends to the destruction of this last antagonist, no less than to the final overthrow of his holiness the pope. Our friends the Wesleyans will especially do well to prepare themselves for the worst, for loud as may be their cry just now against popery, this new man in the writing world would seem to be incapable of perceiving any great difference between a Methodist conference and a popish conclave, and is about to level his artillery against the former with as little mercy as he has shown toward the latter. With regard to Congregationalism it will of course be found immaculate. Should our pugnacious friend be so ill-starred as not to see it in that light, we shall of course be at our post to administer all due correction as the case may require.

Art. V. *The Life of Sir Richard Hill, Bart., M.P. for the County of Shropshire.* By the Rev. EDWIN SIDNEY, A.M., Author of the Life of his Brother, the Rev. Rowland Hill, A.M., &c. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1839. pp. 533.

ON few subjects have there been greater fluctuations of opinion than on the characters of distinguished men. The traduced of their own age are frequently the idols of the age which follows; while, in the period which still succeeds, the multitude arrive at the correct estimate of distinguished persons,—of their merits and their infirmities, their claim, at once, on our admiration and forbearance. Few men have been more undervalued, in their own day, than the leaders of the religious movement of the last century. As a body, more distinguished by zeal than prudence, more marked by piety than knowledge, every one was capable, or, at least, thought himself capable, of rebuking their mistakes; but few were either able or willing to appreciate the zeal, the self-denial, and the benevolence by which those mistakes were redeemed. The world hated them for their religion; and the Church, not only in the better part of the Established communion, but also among the Nonconformists, shunned them for their extravagance. In some recent instances, perhaps, the estimable persons in view may have been extolled too highly; there may have been a nearer approach to their apotheosis than their own piety or humility would have approved. But whatever opinion of this kind may be entertained, it is certain that the leaders of the movement will never cease to be regarded as distinguished benefactors of their country and their species.

In common with, perhaps, the generality of successful reformers, they accomplished a vast deal more than they designed or anticipated. We have no reason to believe that they sat down and sketched their plans of operation with a view to the results which have actually flowed from them. In the simplicity of their hearts, they obeyed the calls of present duty; an obedience that conducted to results which, in the early part of their career, were most distant from their thoughts. Their first object was their own *literary* and religious improvement: while pursuing this object circumstances awakened their solicitude for the good of others;*

* In a letter to the father of Mr. Morgan, of Christ Church, whose death was slanderously said to have been hastened by the rigorous fasting imposed on him by the Wesleys, Mr. John Wesley writes, 'In November, 1729, at which time I came to reside at Oxford, your son, my brother, myself, and one more, agreed to spend three or four evenings in a week together. Our design was to read over the classics, which we had before read in private, on com-

but nothing could have been further from their minds than that, in the course of far less than a century, they should be represented by the immense body of Wesleyan and other Methodists, as well as by a large section of the ministers and supporters of the Established Church.

For awhile, the Methodists were of one mind. The most attached Episcopalians of their number did not scruple the performance of irregular acts. Gradually, however, they separated into two parties, the one anxious to promote religion through means auxiliary to the Church, and the other, anxious by an exact obedience to the terms of conformity, to advance religion *in* the Church. Each party pursued its object; and each has secured its end.

The subject of this memoir was a highly ornamental adherent to Evangelical Episcopacy, at the period when it was beginning to loosen its connexion with Methodism; a connexion which he lived to see dissolved. Sir Richard Hill 'was born on the sixth day of June, 1732, at Hawkstone,' in Shropshire, the admired residence of the family for many generations. As the birth-place of the Rev. Rowland Hill, the brother of Sir Richard, must be an object of curiosity, we transcribe the following passage.

mon nights, and on Sunday some book in divinity. In the summer following Mr. M. told me he had called at the gaol, to see a man who was condemned for killing his wife; and that from the talk he had with one of the debtors, he verily believed it would do much good if any one would be at the pains of now and then speaking with them. This he so frequently repeated, that on the 24th of August, 1730,* my brother and I walked with him to the Castle. We were so well satisfied with our conversation there, that we agreed to go thither once or twice a week; which we had not done long before he desired me to go with him to see a poor woman in the town, who was sick. In this employment too, when we came to reflect upon it, we believed it would be worth while to spend an hour or two in a week, provided the minister of the parish in which any such person was, were not wholly against it.' Such is Mr. Wesley's account of the origin of Methodism; an account which confers the honors of paternity on Mr. Morgan rather than on Mr. Wesley himself. This view of the case is confirmed by a preceding passage in the same letter. 'In one practice for which you blamed your son I am only concerned as a friend, *not as a partner*. That therefore I shall consider first: your own account of it was in effect this, 'He frequently went into poor people's houses, in the villages about Holt, called their children together, and instructed them in their duty to God, their neighbour, and themselves. He likewise explained to them the necessity of private as well as public prayer, and provided them with such forms as were best suited to their several capacities.'—Letter to the Father of Mr. Morgan, of Christ Church, prefixed to 'An Extract of the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's Journal from his embarking for Georgia (1735) to his return to London.'

* It is remarkable that active Methodism should have originated on a day so distinguished in the annals of old Nonconformity.

'Though I felt yesterday,' says a popular tourist,* writing from Hawkstone, 'perfectly blasé of parks, and thought I could never take any interest in them again, I am quite of another mind to-day, and must in some respects give Hawkstone the preference over all I have seen. It is not art, nor magnificence, nor aristocratical splendour, but nature alone, to which it is indebted for this pre-eminence; and in such a degree, that were I gifted with the power of adding to its beauties, I should ask, *what can I add?* So commanding is the situation of this enchanting ground, that from the lofty column erected to the memory of a distinguished ancestor of the Hills, the first Protestant Lord Mayor of London, the eye can wander over fifteen counties, or rest upon the curious rocks and woods mingled with the richest pasturage immediately beneath it. Three sides of this wide panorama rise and fall in a constant change of hill and dale, like the waves of an agitated sea, and are bounded at the horizon by the strangely formed jagged outline of the Welsh mountains, which at either end descend to a fertile plain, shaded by thousands of lofty trees, till, in the obscure distance, it blends with a white misty line—the ocean.'—pp. 3, 4.

At an early period of life, and by means, of which an interesting record will be found in this volume, Sir Richard Hill was brought to the possession of true religion. From this period his entire soul was, as far as human frailty would allow, devoted to God and goodness. It does not appear that he was ever formally connected with the Methodists, yet although attached to the Church of England, he became a preacher; but apprehending, probably, that he could, in other forms, promote religion more effectually, he soon relinquished the function.

His first appearance as an author was in the year 1768, when in a pamphlet entitled *Pietas Oxoniensis*, he came forth as the champion of the six students who had been expelled from St. Edmund's Hall. Of this transaction Mr. Sidney has presented a correct and an interesting account. The University documents with regard to this affair do no honor, in any form, to the rulers of Oxford. With regard to the *Pietas Oxoniensis* Mr. Sidney justly says,

'I confess that though he proves that the reformation truths opposed, are contained in the pandect of our Church's doctrine, he would have written much more effectively, had he taken them simply on their own broad scriptural basis, instead of calling them by any other name, in order that he might attack the notions of the Arminians. He weakened his cause and prejudiced many of his readers by this course, as well as by the levity he mingled with his gravest arguments—a fault (which) both he and his brother, Mr. Rowland Hill, were too apt to commit.'—p. 112.

* Tour of a German Prince.

The Dissenters of that day, for the most part, stood aloof from the Church and Methodist controversy; but the most popular production called forth by the discussion, was written by a Dissenting minister, the Rev. John Macgowan. His pamphlet is entitled 'Priestcraft Defended. A Sermon occasioned by the expulsion of Six Young Gentlemen from the University of Oxford for Praying, Reading, and Expounding the Scriptures. Humbly dedicated to Mr. V—— C——r and the H——ds of 'H——s. By their humble servant, The Shaver.' The Shaver's sermon is not altogether conformed to the requirements of an exact criticism, but it contains a vast deal of genuine wit, and must have told powerfully against the learned but (as their own papers show) obtuse men, whom it was designed to reprove. Mr. Sidney censures the Shaver for taking his text from a newspaper; but Mr. Macgowan's error did not consist in the quarter from which he derived his text; (his error would have been greater had he obtained it from the Bible), but in putting his satire into the form of a sermon. It seems, however, to be the fate of Oxford to array herself, once or twice in a century, with a pompous stolidity which, in spite of herself, is sure to turn her gravest opponent into a satirist: a consideration which, had 'Pietas Oxoniensis' contained the only instance of mingled seriousness and levity in the writings of its excellent author, might have disarmed the rebuke which has just been quoted.

In the following year, Mr. Hill (for he had not yet succeeded to the baronetcy) appeared as the champion of his friend, the Rev. William Romaine. The latter gentleman having preached at St. Chad's, Shrewsbury, his sermon gave great offence to the vicar, Dr. Adams. The doctor preached a sermon in reply, which, four months afterwards, was printed. 'This roused the indignation of Mr. Richard Hill, and caused him to print a letter to Dr. Adams on his sermon.' Dr. Adams was not a Calvinist, but he was an excellent man, the friend of Sir James Stonehouse, Mr. Orton, and Mr. Stedman, and imbued with the spirit of these distinguished ministers. Mr. Orton engaged in this controversy, in which he published two pamphlets; he embarked in it, however, rather as a moderator than as an antagonist. We apprehend, that the subject of this memoir depreciated Dr. Adams, a course in which his biographer seems to unite. On the other hand, Mr. Orton had far too low an opinion of Sir Richard Hill. Referring to his Answer to 'Flechere's Checks,' Mr. Orton says, 'Mr. Hill's Answer is weak, childish, and fawning. He now speaks out, and shows himself to be, what I always thought him, a rank Antinomian, and thorough in the worst sentiments of Dr. Crisp.*'

* Orton's Letters to Dissenting Ministers, vol. ii. p. 132.

It is delightful to think that these good men, Adams and Romaine, Orton and Hill, have passed into a world where suspicion and contest are no more.

Although Mr. Hill was not formally connected with any class of Methodists, he felt a deep interest, and sometimes took a share, in their proceedings. We have, hence, an interesting account of the memorable Wesleyan Conference of 1770. We regret the terms which Mr. Sidney employs with regard to Thomas Olivers. The man who bequeathed to the Christian church that fine hymn, 'The God of Abrah'm praise,' is entitled to some other designation than either 'Thomas Olivers,' 'the Welshman,' or 'Thomas Olivers, the cobbler.' Mr. Olivers, whatever extravagancies he might utter in the warmth of controversy, was an estimable man. 'These were the days of our folly,' was his language many years afterwards, when referring to the stormy period of which we are speaking.

'In the autumn of 1780, Mr. Richard Hill was returned, without opposition, to parliament for his native county.' In August, 1783, he 'succeeded to the title and estates of his father, Sir 'Rowland.' Almost from the beginning of his parliamentary career, Sir Richard Hill adhered steadily though not servilely to the politics of Mr. Pitt, who entered the House a few months after him. Like Mr. Pitt, the subject of this memoir entered parliament a reformer; and like him, he seemed to discover that any time was fitter for reform than the time present. Sir Richard opposed the continuance of the anti-revolutionary war. It would, however, have been more to his honor, had he opposed its commencement, as well as the tyranny by which the government did its best to promote a revolution at home. He was a frequent speaker in the House. Few were the important debates which he did not enliven by his wit. The fertility of his imagination was sometimes displayed by the suggestion of new taxes; an exercise of ingenuity which a modern member would find rather hazardous. Some of his parliamentary suggestions, as the tax on hair-powder, and the impolitic and long since repealed tax on watches, were adopted; while others of them, as a tax to be paid on admission to the theatres, a tax of rather questionable morality, and a tax on 'all livings and benefices above a certain value, all 'deans, chapters, bishoprics, and all idle non-resident clergy,' were rejected. A proposal from an evangelical Episcopalian, to tax the rich and idle clergy, would be a phenomenon in our days; nor would it be endured that an honorable member should garnish his parliamentary speech, as Sir Richard Hill did, by reading a copy of his own doggerel verses.

The political portion of the work is well written, and contains a vast deal of interesting information. We transcribe the following passage with regard to Burke.

'Eloquence, which to this day draws forth the warmest emotions of every reader of his wondrous pages, was seldom received by the House, without silent frowns and inattention, or clamorous opposition. Never did there rise in parliament a more unwelcome speaker; and it is impossible to conceive what the gestures and voice could have been that utterly disfigured the creations of his lofty and brilliant imagination. His magnificent language on the affairs of India was met by uproar, and efforts were perpetually made to silence him. Mr. Granville went so far as to tell him, that he was astonished he should press himself so frequently on the House; and after one of his most surprising efforts, Mr. Pitt took not the slightest notice of a word he had said, evidently because it fell powerless on impatient and dissatisfied hearers. Such was the mortification of this wonderful man, and such the reception of speeches, that will be considered of the highest order of composition as long as our language lasts.'— pp. 357, 358.

Sir Richard Hill resigned his seat in parliament in the year 1806, and died on the 28th of November, 1808.

In forming our estimate of his Christian character,—of the strength of the religious principle by which he was governed, the state of that class of society in which he mixed must be considered. We are by no means satisfied that the higher ranks are even now so greatly improved as Mr. Sidney intimates: but in the days of Sir Richard Hill, a member of the patrician classes could not be religious without a complete sacrifice of character among his fellows. That sacrifice Sir Richard cheerfully made; and though we cannot say with Mr. Sidney 'a willing public,' we can say the Christian church, 'will now afford to his memory that deserved reputation, which he was ever ready to sacrifice to the honor of God and the interests of religion.' In point of religious sentiment, he was a strict though not perhaps a high Calvinist. Some of his expressions, however, are such as none but a high Calvinist can approve. Attaching an undue importance to the peculiarities of his creed, he could not be satisfied unless he could bring others to go its whole length; an infirmity which in the case of one of his correspondents, a sceptical man of fashion, appears to have been followed by unhappy consequences. He loved all good men; but his charity was solely the product of pious feeling, and was unaccompanied by the just and enlarged views of Christian liberty, which, while they cherish affection toward the good, dictate tolerance to all. Had a Protestant resident in France converted a Roman Catholic, he would have thought the act meritorious; and yet, when two French emigrant priests had converted an ignorant woman to Catholicism, he wrote to Bishop Porteus to induce him 'to put a stop at least to any further external attempts of these two popish priests.'

The mind of Sir Richard Hill was rather sprightly than pro-

found. His wit often amused the House, but was not always either chaste or dignified ;—nor was the form in which his religious convictions were exhibited invariably the best that might have been chosen. And yet such was the effect of his cheerful, consistent goodness, that he was the object of universal regard; and whether in the senate, or on the bench, he was listened to, not merely with respect, but with an attachment approaching to personal affection. On the whole, *his* was the elevation of goodness more than of greatness; or rather without any faculty highly developed, he became great, through a large degree of the goodness, which is the chief component of true greatness.

The temper of the work before us is bland and Christian. To some few points, however, we object. Mr. Sidney is greatly mistaken in saying that subscription 'does not curtail the 'limits of our Sion.' Subscription has deprived the Church of England of a larger number of well qualified ministers than any other cause. Mr. Sidney appears to think that the blame of the bad spirit which prevails between the Church and the Dissenters, lies exclusively on one side. Far be it from us to say, that while Dissenters have been bringing into light certain great but neglected principles of the New Testament, they have acted in every instance, in the spirit of meekness; but we may ask Mr. Sidney whether his own work, mild as we confess it to be generally, is always quite in the tone of the New Testament? It was not necessary to call the religious edifices of his brethren conventicles; nor was it necessary to introduce Sir Richard Hill's opinion, that Dissenting worship frequently 'disgusts or hurts the feelings of a congregation.' Mr. Sidney knows, though possibly Sir Richard Hill did not, that the devotional services of the great body of educated Dissenting ministers, contain at least as few verbal inaccuracies as the liturgy requires its readers to repeat. In common with many of his brethren, our author exclaims against the Oxford sect in the matter of tradition and baptismal regeneration; but he protests not against their primary error of apostolical succession: a procedure the more remarkable as the Church to which Mr. Sidney has pledged his unfeigned assent and consent, countenances the two former errors, and, by implication, decidedly opposes the latter.

With regard to its literary execution, the work is, on the whole, respectable. There is, however, rather too much of gentlemanly nonchalance in the construction of some of the sentences; a nonchalance which, in competent writers, always reminds us of the youthful courtiers who first used powder in their hair, because the aged monarch had grown grey. The higher classes would not write carelessly if their education and attainments enabled them to write correctly. The county of Shropshire, as written in the

title-page, is an awkward redundancy. The interesting journal of Miss Hill, and, perhaps, some other parts of the work, would have appeared better in an appendix. In conclusion, we cordially thank Mr. Sidney for an able, acceptable, and useful addition to the rich treasures of religious biography.

Art. VI. *The Inquirer*. October, 1839. Art. *The Plymouth Brethren and the Eclectic Review*. London: J. Dinnis.

THE 'Inquirer' of October, 1839, contains an elaborate answer by one of the Plymouth Brethren, to the article in our May number concerning them. As this writer has taxed us with disingenuousness and open misstatements, we are forced to reply; otherwise we should have avoided putting ourselves into controversy with an individual.

He opens with many pious but misplaced thoughts on the painfulness of being attacked and having to defend oneself; and throughout, indeed, by entitling us *accusers, assailants, &c.*, he might seem to be laboring under the delusion, that it is we who began the assault. He reminds us of the duty of dealing as tenderly with the Lord's brethren as with the Lord himself; and afterwards intimates that we might have cried out, *crucify him*, against Jesus himself. In concluding, he warns us to let them alone, lest haply we be found fighting against God. Any one would suppose that the Brethren had never assailed us, nor our views: or that they had employed only words and arguments, while we answered with deeds of violence. Yet from the very beginning of their course they have not ceased to attack our principles and the persons of our leading men, sometimes by name; in print and by word of mouth. One strong instance from the 1st vol. of the *Christian Witness* will show what they *can* say, p. 392 (on the Present Apostacy). 'The gospel sets forth the alienation, 1st, of the [Jewish] nation as a whole; 2ndly, of ALL the religionists of the day; 3rdly, of the Instructors and Officers, Scribes and Lawyers, Elders, Priests, and High Priest; and, lastly, of the people as persuaded by them. And this we say, *with all confidence*, that they who have not proved in their own persons the *very* same among the professors of our day' [here *very* is printed in italics], 'either have *not* the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, or have the guilt of burying its light in their own bosoms.' What an unamiable bigot! our readers may exclaim. No such thing: it is an enthusiast, perhaps really amiable, but cramped in heart and stunted in mind by false notions; not least,

by the habit of imagining * *all* mental error to be a result of sin. In the *mode* of address different men will of course differ exceedingly, but there is this in substance common to his party, that they try to act on your *conscience* (assuming that it is guilty), not on your intellect, if you do not assent to them. This Brother accordingly imputes evil motives to us, and goes steadily to work to depreciate our moral principle. Such a mass of misconceptions we never remember to have met with in the like space, as in his reply; but we have been obliged to strike out from our MS. the explanations of many of them; for even now this article exceeds all reasonable limits. This inaptitude on his part is not from natural dulness; nor do we believe that it is from dishonesty; but it is because he sees through a Plymouth medium. Of this we think our readers will find proof enough as we proceed, though we can only exhibit a part of what his reply furnishes.

Yet as we would on no account defend our faults by those of another, we have been reviewing carefully all that we said, and do not find that we have laid any such immoral imputations on the Brethren, individually or collectively. Certainly we did not impugn their good faith or sincerity: nay, we spoke very freely concerning their many praiseworthy points of conduct and character. We did not grudge them their liberty to establish in their own church whatever they believe right: we did not attack their Open Ministry as wicked or absurd: but we attacked their *intolerance*. Our Brother appears little to understand the difference of assailing persons† and assailing principles; otherwise he would not charge us with ‘inconsistency’‡ (the great staple of his reply), because we can see good in his party, and are not afraid to publish it. Forsooth, if George Fox or Ignatius Loyola were again to run their course among us, we should be ‘inconsistent’ in strongly opposing and exposing their errors while we cheerfully acknowledged their benevolent intentions, their deep piety, and thorough self-devo-

* We do not mean to imply that the Brethren have more than very partially developed the results of this evil dogma.

† They attack the *personal character* of Dissenters, more than of others. For an illustration of their mode, we quote from *Christian Witness*, Vol. i. p. 354, ‘Their systems are on the whole more scriptural than the Church of England, *but their practice worse*. It is clear also that (speaking of them as a body) the same fact which gives the character of apostacy to the Establishment,—union with the world, stamps the same features upon modern dissent: and *in a form more fearful*, because *with infinitely less of spirituality among individuals*, it is more connected with the irreligion and ungodliness of popular feeling.’

‡ He cannot understand how any one should covet power over men’s minds more than rank or money!

tion to the cause they had espoused! The Brother gratuitously ascribes to us the temper of a 'slandrous' partisan, and then looks on it as self-confuting that we do not act up to it. He also taunts us with inconsistency, because we do not contend that *our* systems are perfect, though he most gladly jumps at every concession which we make, or seem to make, on this side.

Some of the nonsense which he endeavors to extract from the opening of our article, is as follows: that we do as one who praises a servant for respectful submission to his master's authority, while he was breaking his commands: that we speak of primitive Episcopacy as the first departure from the divine order, and allege the necessity of the case; hereby casting a bold imputation of want of wisdom and forethought on God: that we confess, but coolly abide in, degeneracy of condition and apostacy from God's order: that we declare, it is not right to desire, that which we avow it is our sin not to have; and that we ought to aim at things too hurtful to be desired.—Reasoning which we had addressed specially against the views of persons who 'from the days of Dr. Owen to the present,' aimed at imitating the ancient church in the *number* of presbyters, he represents as intended for a confutation of the Brethren's views. Having poured ridicule upon it with much appearance of justice, he then complains of our misrepresenting the question; as though what *they* cared for was merely the 'number' and not the principle! Afterwards (in a note to p. 513), he not obscurely imputes this to craft on our part, and remarks that we 'do not even attempt a vindication of 'close ministry.' Why is he determined that we shall quarrel with him here? Because he does not know what toleration means. That which in us is forbearance and a desire to grant our brethren their just freedom, he mistakes for hypocrisy. Our plain statements of that which is good in them (as, that they hold it right to do good in detail* by preaching the gospel, feeding the hungry, tending the sick), he regards as a heartless sarcasm: and in every doubtful case interprets our words for the worse. He seems even annoyed that we are not dogmatic (note to p. 498): 'I cannot accuse this writer of dogmatism; *his principles appear too lax and unsettled for that: and besides, as regards himself and his associates, he only stands on the defensive.*' Are we not then very cruel assailants?

His misrepresentation of our views concerning church order is (unintentionally) so erroneous, and so ingenious, that we must

* We disapprove, indeed, of their total, schismatic *isolation* of themselves; and of their supposing that acts of parliament are indifferent to the morals and religion of a country; which is a most erroneous and hurtful opinion. The words, *in detail*, were intended to imply the contrast of private to combined or legislative acts.

explain ourselves more at large; after which we shall leave our readers to say whether we are so self-contradictory.

We hold that a church consists of true Christians, acting together for mutual spiritual profit, under different forms and modes, better and worse: that the inevitable intermixture of unsound with sound disciples will probably embarrass, but need not absolutely hinder, the general edification. We apprehend that a practical separation of all members into two classes, the teachers and the taught (often called laity and ministers), will ever take place: for the ministry of the word is so absorbing and great a matter, that few can do it by halves; but he who begins to teach, (if qualified), soon gives himself wholly to it. No wall of partition between the two classes, we believe, exists: want of competence or of leisure, not want of any formality, excludes brethren from ministering. Thus far, we believe, the Brethren hold with the writer; and he is not aware that there is any difference of principle between them and common Dissenters. Yet for this Brother to paraphrase our words 'all professors of religion,' by 'Pharisees, covetous,' &c., appears to us unbecoming and absurd; when he knows that the apostles had no direct method of excluding such persons. Does he mean to make it an axiom, that there are no 'Pharisees, covetous,' &c., among his own party?

If the Brethren have found a new and better method of assisting the passage from the one class to the other (that is, of *training teachers*), viz., by the system of open ministry, let them come and teach us; or let them set the example in a friendly way, and, if it is really better, others will gradually follow it. But let them not meanwhile heap invective on the method, which we, in our ignorance, but with good intentions, follow. This Brother imputes to us the opinion that scholastic learning suffices to make a minister, and (although writing evidently under a great desire to moderate his *expressions*) appears to justify our strong statement, that they cannot allude to Dissenting academies 'without 'an ecstasy of scorn.' P. 495, 'The colleges would, I suppose, 'furnish *any* number of *them*' [teachers]; and, as to 'want of 'gifts, scholastic divinity and rhetoric would be a sufficient substitute for *these*.' We know no Congregationalists who doubt whether the *first* qualification for ministry comes from the Spirit of God.

We hold, farther, that the apostles adapted all their regulations to the immediate wants of their day. The widows were relieved by deacons in one place, in another they were under the management of Timothy, with special arrangements suggested by the progress of events. Presbyters or bishops at Philippi and Ephesus, but teachers and ministers of various sorts at Corinth, and probably at Rome, were raised up and acknowledged or appointed in office, with no exact uniformity at first. The framework of

the church, as the Brethren rightly teach, was moulded by the life within; so that it was a true representative of inward power or of deep-felt need. The evidence of the Apocalypse serves to convince the writer that *primitive* episcopacy (not diocesan) was becoming general in the lifetime of apostles; and the 'necessity of the case' was one which acted as much in their presence, as behind their back. Nay, they themselves at Jerusalem recognized in James that priority, which other churches imitated, and soon learned to entitle Episcopacy. But the Brother imputes to us a statement that this was a departure from the divine order! and says we are boldly imputing to God a want of forethought.

Now human nature being ever in the main like itself, and the first anomalies of the ancient church having so soon disappeared, that we can speak of one particular form, viz., Congregational Episcopacy, as *the* primitive one; it is a fair *presumption*, that the nearer our system is to the apostolic, the better. Moreover, it is highly inexpedient, and therefore wrong, capriciously to deviate from that model: for the following of precedent (in civil or ecclesiastical matters) is most valuable to save disputes concerning indifferent things. The burden of proof, therefore, rests with him who vindicates a departure from apostolic precedent. He has, as it were, to apologize, and to establish that we cannot or ought not to adhere to it, owing to our *change of circumstances*. It was in this apologizing tone that we wrote the opening pages of our former article. But on the other hand, we think the Brethren to be decidedly and mischievously wrong in teaching that the apostolic regulations are our law for imitation; a law by which the Brethren themselves must inevitably be condemned. We believe that the grand universal *precepts*, and the spirit of Christianity itself, diffused through the apostolic writings, are our eternal law: but that their *conduct* in its detail cannot always be wisely imitated. When they adopt rules for churches possessed of miraculous gifts, to imitate them might be absurd, if we have no such gifts: to lay hands, as they did, on newly baptized adults, or even to anoint the sick, might in us be an act of presumption. It is useless to imitate their forms, where it is undeniable that we cannot realize the spirit and inward substance of those forms. It is better to have our church a living reality, adapted to the wants and circumstances of the nineteenth century, than a stuffed image of the first.

But to be set on having many presbyters in every church, barely to imitate the outside of the apostolic arrangements, when we cannot imitate apostolic unanimity, might be but a sham reformation. If brought about by the actings of the *legal* principle, (as though it were an abstract duty), we rather contemplate mischief from it. By establishing so strongly the importance of a *FORM*, it might once more elevate church officers into an over-

ruling caste. Hence (we suggested) 'perhaps it is not much to be lamented that we cannot.' In the providence of God, evil is neutralized by evil. Nothing here is perfect, but if errors be opposite in character, they usefully balance each other. It is imperfection (and it is ordinarily connected with sin), that strong intellectual differences exist. Yet while perfection is not attained, it is possibly seen by the All-Wise to be better that we err in many ways, than all in one way. On the other hand, it appeared to us that there is no real and powerful impediment to a greater measure of co-operation among Dissenting churches than generally exists, and that many advantages might accrue from a greater blending of them. Reunions produced by the acting of a freer and larger spirit, not by imitating an antique exterior, but by developing a modern reality, would be accompanied with an establishment of the right limits of private judgment and mutual toleration. It would set up union and peace on the basis of justice * and freedom : and be in little danger of rivetting upon us mere chains of formality. It ought not to be aimed at in order to produce 'a fine show of presbyters' (for in such words we indicated our fear that one zealous for antiquity † might gain only an empty parade), but for its intrinsic advantages. If we discuss with such an one the accomplishment of his end, we must discuss it as an outward thing to be brought about by direct outward effort, and it appears to us greatly to resolve itself into a question of 'pounds, shillings, and pence.' We may be wrong in all this ; but a person who can turn it into such nonsense as was above produced, shows a want of common sense himself.

The Brother is offended that we do *not* maintain our churches to be true counterparts of the apostolic system ; which he holds to be a perfect model. He regards it as our duty to maintain this, or else, quit our position as untenable. 'We have seen,' says he, p. 497, 'aggravated evil coolly confessed and coolly vindicated.' This 'aggravated evil' is, the sin generally accompanying separation and schisms ; such, *for instance*, as the separation of the Brethren from all other churches. The Brother cannot embrace, at least cannot retain, so strange a thought as that we included the formation of the Plymouth body among separations ? He thinks we are as it were complimenting them by comparison. Again, p. 494 [the Eclectic reviewers], 'have *admittedly* departed from the apostolic model, which, as regards ecclesiastical 'order, is simply APOSTACY.' The *admissions* which we made

* 'Who art thou that judgeth thy brother?' &c., is a principle, the *letter* of which is familiar to all ; but which this brother sufficiently shows he does not practically understand.

† *Highest antiquity* [*why not Scripture?*] says our acute critic.

include the Brethren and all other churches; inasmuch as, we conceive, nothing but sects can now possibly exist. Yet farther, p. 512, 'If the writer does not regard [the Establishment] as 'apostate, he is guilty of sin in not living within its pale.' We differ widely from this Brother. If of two churches, one is ill-managed and opposes vast obstacles to change, while another is somewhat better ordered, and presents inferior impediments; we hold ourselves at liberty to move from the worse to the better, in spite of all this fulmination; though we may neither believe the former to be apostate, nor the latter to be perfectly apostolic. We believe that this Brother speaks the sentiments of his whole body, in allowing nothing between these extremes. Forsooth, we may not go *out*, unless a church be apostate; and may not come *in* unless its constitution be perfectly apostolic. A singular dilemma.

He attributes to us a confession of degeneracy; and after various severe deductions, asks whether we were intending to prove that it was no degeneracy at all. Great acuteness was not needed to see that we laid no vehement stress on the matter in question, and, indeed, had no very fixed opinion; but supposed another person, zealous 'for the highest antiquity,' to consider us degenerate. He imagines that we as it were envied the 'fine 'show' of presbyters, if we understand his italics. At a later part (p. 513) he strangely gives it as our opinion, that the Dissenting churches 'grieve and quench the Spirit; and that this is to be lamented.' He has seized upon a supposed incautious admission. We merely imagined (p. 586) a Plymouth Brother to allege this, and for arguments sake admitting it, we urged that, *even so*, it did not justify them in refusing to unite in charitable and religious societies, outside of all churches. But here, as elsewhere, it is clear that this Brother holds all churches, but his own, to be guilty of this sin (churches known and unknown to him) by virtue of their mere constitution. The churches over which Baxter, Howe, Owen, Doddridge presided (honored names with the Brethren, we believe), were all apostate; *for* they had departed from the divine order and appointment! We confidently ask, Is not this, under the pretence of honoring the Spirit, a shocking over-valuing of outward form; the very essence of high Church error?

He calls our phrase, 'attraction of cohesion,' a new name for *Christian love*. A little attention to our argument, or a slight knowledge of church history, would have shown him that we spoke of *cohesion without love*; which was common in the church for fifteen centuries. Christians generally quarrelled *within* the pale, but none were willing to go out of it. They might dispute who should be bishop, but they did not dispute whether bishops ought to exist. No one dreamed of changing the organization; hence secessions did not take place.

Our disputes are, on the contrary, more concerning the right organization, than about any thing else. This constitutes a difference of circumstance between us and the primitive disciples, which (let the Brethren kick against the pricks as much as they please) makes it absolutely impossible for us to imitate the comprehensiveness of the apostolic churches. We are all of necessity sects, sections, or denominations, persuasions, if any prefer these softer terms. The Brother regards us as 'self-condemned,' because we speak of dissenting sects. Does he forget that we used the same term of the Brethren? It is an untractable phenomenon, that a Plymouth Brother cannot in conscience become a common Dissenter; nor can an Episcopalian become one of the Brethren; nor can a Quaker become an Episcopalian: and so on. A church constructed to offend in its organization the conscience of *no one*, cannot exist; as long as this stubborn fact subsists, the direct contrariety of consciences. The Brethren flatter themselves most egregiously, in pretending that they are ail-comprehensive. They will admit, no doubt, any Christian *who will submit to their regulations*; and so will Independents or Presbyterians: but none of the three will break up their existing order to please an applicant for admission. The Brethren will not give up Open Ministry, and take to bishops and priests, to satisfy the conscience of an Episcopalian. Open Ministry then is their '*bond of union*,' and it is a point '*of difference, not of agreement*,' among the true people of God. By this Brother's own criterion, therefore (note, p. 494), his church is a sect. Shall we, then, have no churches at all, no order, no ministry, until we are agreed as to the right church order? Shall we, on the one hand, acquiesce, without grudging or murmuring, that each body should regulate its own concerns, claiming to be acknowledged as a church, yet allowing that other bodies are churches too? Or, on the other, shall each of us protest that *his* alone is the true church, and that all others are counterfeits, or (to use the Brethren's phrase) are apostate? Now to *acquiesce* under the overwhelming difficulty is generally designated by '*agreeing to differ*.' We had stated that the Brethren disapproved of this. This 'Brother' in name broadly denies it (p. 505); yet in a note he allows that it is highly probable that we have heard many of them speak to that effect; only (he thinks) meaning that they disliked '*indifferentism*.' But he himself most fully warrants us in reasserting, that he regards it as a sin, to agree to differ at least concerning the constitution of churches; which is the most critical and important case. Again, we complained that they would not co-operate on neutral ground (p. 575), and that they pretended nothing was neutral (p. 586). Now on this the Brother remarks (p. 498), '*Neutral ground; THAT IS, ground which would involve a violation of principle, a*

'*sanction of evil, and defilement of conscience.*' Do they not then practically regard nothing as neutral? that is, do they not think it wrong to agree to differ? And does not this Brother plainly avow that they will co-operate with no Christians except those of their own sentiments (p. 509)? *He* catches at our expressions; *we* look at the substance and meaning of their words and actions alike, and we find this clear result; that at a time when other dissenting bodies are learning more and more to avoid arrogant pretensions (the grand foundation of schism), the Plymouth Brethren, like the Church of England, avow and defend them. Nay, this Brother rebukes us for not doing the same. 'The Eclectic writer,' says he, p. 514, 'has no quarrel with them (the Brethren) for *leaving* other churches. He does not unite with the Churchman in the cry of schism.' [This, we are to suppose, would seem pardonable.] 'No, he is angry with them for molesting the peace of other churches,' &c. Most assuredly we are. We would not call our Brother a bigot, because we trust he has too many good elements of another kind in him; but we think, in so far as *this* point is concerned, he shows a bigot's sympathy with bigots. 'The Church of England declares she is the only church in England (says the Brother virtually); *this* is bearable; for so do we declare the same of ourselves. But the Eclectic Review says, Let each man obey his conscience, and unite himself to the best church he can find or make; but let no one disturb the peace of other churches *by exclusive pretensions* [these were our words, p. 583, though the Brother, inadvertently we presume, did not notice them]; now *that* is 'unbearable indifference and worldliness.'

We had believed that the Brethren had too much experience of the unjust pretensions of the Establishment not to understand the following sentence of ours, p. 573: 'If any one allege that herein consists our sin, that we are so ready to separate from one another, he will state a great truth; *yet a truth which may easily be so used as to inculcate error and injustice.*' We meant, as our next paragraph showed, that the separations of churches oftener took place in anger than in love; yet, that it is a gross injustice and absurdity to say, 'Our Lord would have us all to be of one mind; therefore it is *your* duty to be of *our* mind:' which is the common reasoning of Churchmen. This Brother instantly commits the very injustice which we deprecated; not perceiving that '*our sin*' includes all Protestants.

So admirable is his self-satisfaction that after accepting our statements concerning the divisions of the churches, he adds, 'And if this (the Brethren's) remonstrance be ALMOST UNIVERSAL in its aspect, it is accounted for by our opposer, when he says, that this bad and degenerate state of things is the case *not of Congregationalism, but of Protestantism.*' Thus the

Brother even forgets that he is a Protestant, and looks on our words as a justification of his sect! He regards his party as something so unique as to fall under no category. It is excluded from all common terms, such as Separatists, Dissenters, Protestants; and, naturally, it has exclusive privileges to correspond. They are pet lambs of God, who are permitted to butt with all their might at any one who enters his house, but whom no one can touch without impiety.

Perhaps he will say, that it is *the possession of the truth* which justifies him and his church, and makes them to be catholic and others to be sects. We hold that it does not justify any assumption of superiority. Each church *believes* that it possesses the truth; but which *is* true, God has given no earthly judge. We must meanwhile live on terms of equality. If any Christian be 'weak' in conscience, and through over-scrupulosity cannot bear close ministry, while his fellow Christians can bear either the close or the open, he might plead with them for enlargement on this ground; and those who look on it as entirely a question of expediency, might be able to effect some compromise. Patient representations, *and truth to back them*, work wonders in a church not nailed down by endowments. If the Brethren be really the 'strong' ones, this would enable them to bear up against ignorance, prejudice, love of traditionary customs, or any of the other things, which (with much or little grounds) they often impute to common Dissenters. But unhappily these Brethren allow no neutral ground on these matters, and abhor compromise; which abhorrence must to others mean, that they are determined to have all their own way.

But we must proceed to our alleged misstatements. The Brother has here got up a case against us by a variety of methods. *First*, whereas we had again and again declared that they violently disapproved of creeds and test articles, he has represented us as pretending that they *enforced* all the opinions of which we spoke; and when he has nothing else to object against our statements, he alleges that the opinions are 'freely held.' Yet he clearly discerned that we were not writing their creed, for he remarks that all essential articles of the faith are omitted; while he actually imputes this to us as a fault. We are not absurd enough to imagine that a creed can be 'enforced' on any mass of men, much less on English seceders. Nay, in Popery as in corrupt Judaism, it has always been, 'My people love to have it so.' Coercion falls on the units, not on the multitude. *Secondly*, some opinions are checked and corrected by others; so that two combined make a different thing from two viewed separately: and that which is in theory contradictory is harmonized in practice. This happens peculiarly with the Brethren, from their habit of very broad and exaggerated statement. Now in such cases, this

Brother represents us as 'confuting ourselves !' Equally undiscerning is he as to the real * contradictions ; the fault of which lies at the Brethren's door, not ours. Moreover, when we believed that they were not wholly agreed *among themselves*, we did not feel it right to force and pinch their views, so as to produce an unreal harmony. A great and substantial agreement there is, as this Brother indeed boasts ; but we did not pretend that it was perfect, especially as to the minutiae of interpretation which have no immediate result. *Thirdly*, we warned our readers that the phraseology into which we translated their language would often be disowned by the Brethren ; yet he has criticised it word by word, as though we had alleged it all to be theirs. *Fourthly*, we did not pretend to exhibit doctrines held or believed by them all, but currently taught and inculcated ; and in drawing general conclusions we never adverted to the points of detail, as though these were believed generally. For instance, the important point is, not whether they all hold a special exposition of the Old Testament, but whether they all assent to the principle on which such exposition rests, when it is an extravagant one ; or dictate concerning it in a haughty tone, when this is the thing which we were exhibiting. Every part of our account is drawn either from their books or from the life ; but we have done as a painter in drawing a national likeness, viz., in selecting strong and well developed features, thoroughly characteristic. In this way the spectator best apprehends the style of countenance, and gains what we called a 'substantially faithful' impression, 'as a whole.' But we spoke of many individuals, as having 'but partially imbibed or understood the system.' This Brother, therefore, deals unfairly, in pretending that we attributed all these opinions to every one. *Fifthly*, he has greatly misrepresented us, in suppressing the fact, that we ourselves informed the reader that Mr. P. Hall disavowed the statement that the government of the world is under the devil's guidance. That which we alleged *must logically follow* from Mr. H.'s views, and is essentially *implicated* in them, this Brother by partial quotations pretends that we impute as Mr. H.'s explicit doctrine ; and then adduces quotations from Mr. H. which add nothing to what we have already said. *Sixthly*, he speaks as though we were holding up Mr. H. *personally* to odium, as the supporter of 'ungodly' and 'wicked' doctrines (such are the Brother's words) ; as if we pretended Mr. H. to desire a dissolution of civil society ! And then, our declaration that the Brethren were *practically* support-

* It is not wonderful that he does not notice all of these ; for instance, that it is 'lawful to lend, but unlawful to borrow ;' an impossible union of correlatives, as we think.

ers of Tory principles (in which this Brother seems to glory), which ought to have shown him that he has misrepresented us, is adduced by him as inconsistent and self-confuting on our part. *Seventhly*, he puts us before his readers in the light of hypocrites, who hate the Brethren for concealed reasons, and attack them for sham ones. Their intolerance; their hatred to civil liberty and apathy as to breaking the chains of the slave; their infatuated contempt of mental cultivation; which are with us prominent and avowed grounds of opposing their system, this Brother represents as so many points, which, we suppose by great acuteness, he has discovered that we dislike. *Eighthly*, to aggravate all the above, he most gratuitously imagines that we disapprove of all the opinions which we name as current among them; and makes use of this to give us some very needless grave admonitions. Yet we distinctly declared, 'Many of their opinions appear to us to involve valuable truth;' words which he quotes, but does not believe. *Ninthly*, he has in two instances really misquoted our words, while putting a false sense upon them, so as to obtain pretence for contradiction. These will be noticed presently.

By help of so many engines he produces the appearance of much injustice on our part; and yet, as to the *general result*, every practical and important doctrine which we ascribed, he accepts, either by passing over our pointed statements, or by express avowal; sometimes using stronger and more precise terms than we would have ventured to adopt. On the other hand, the points contested by him are not practical, and several of them are marked by us as necessarily theoretic. Indeed, as regards the case between us and the Brethren, we should willingly adopt this Brother's own letter as the groundwork and book of reference; for every erroneous and hurtful principle which we ascribe to them is defended or exhibited by him.

He plainly intimates that he is justified in charging us with falsehood, because we did not verify our assertions from the Christian Witness. We did not do so, *first*, because, while convinced ourselves that the great mass of its sentiments is held by the Brethren, we knew that they would appeal against it, if we tried to 'demonstrate' by quotations that they held an opinion which it was not otherwise notorious that they held. And herein this Brother justifies us, for he declares that such quotations would go for nothing (p. 499). But, *secondly*, having had considerable means of personal observation, the writer held himself at liberty to use such sources, particularly because the system is one which is not always the same on paper and in reality. Reading this Brother's declaration, that 'they do not think it wrong 'to agree to differ,' and the eloquent extracts which he makes on this subject, any one might imagine them a most comprehensive and liberal body, which is very contrary to the fact:

Read their declamations against the imposing of a creed, and you will not suspect what the Brother unawares confesses, as we shall show, that this is but a name. Moreover, by numerous expressions the reader was given to understand, that we had other means of knowledge beside the books whose titles were prefixed; as indeed it is very customary with reviews to set the names of books, as mottoes, at the head of an article. Whatever personal responsibility the writer hereby incurred, is relieved, if not entirely removed, by this Brother himself; and as for a few points that remain, *not affecting the general question*, the writer is most willing to bear it.

The bad features which we ascribed to their system may be described as intolerance, censoriousness, exaggeration, peremptoriness, hatred of freedom, contempt of mental cultivation, and (consequent) loss of common sense in the exposition of Scripture. The Brother refutes none of these; but avows some, and pretty clearly exhibits the rest. Their chief practical opinions may be concisely stated, as those concerning open ministry, concerning educating ministers, concerning democracy in the church and the receiving of ministers, concerning separation, test articles, church history and other literature, the canon of Scripture, worldly property, worldly power, political rights, and improvement of the community; on all which the Brother has none but a fictitious difference from our statement. When in addition to this, we volunteered to say (as from personal knowledge) much that was honorable concerning them, and which we might as well have suppressed, it appears to us an unworthy thing in this Brother, by measured yet sufficiently definite and often repeated language, to hold us up as false witnesses.

In such a mass of confusion as he has produced by his misinterpretations, it is difficult to us to know where to begin explanations; for if we take every detail in order, we shall fill a volume.

I. We begin, then, with what, he says, 'surpasses all our other 'statements in careless hardihood,' the opinions of the Brethren, and particularly of Mr. P. Hall, concerning magistracy. Here the Brother is ignorant of the contrast of meaning between the phrases 'ordained by God's *providence*,' and 'ordained by God's *grace*;' which we have heard so often from eminent men among the Brethren, that we supposed it to be understood by them all. And if not, our own words explained it; for we made *providence* to be that which also ordains 'banditti, earthquake, pestilence;' and said that God 'regulated and controlled even the devil's acts,' and yet this Brother pretends it is contradictory to say, 'ordained 'by providence,' and 'appointed by the devil.'

Now, while we think the doctrine to be very *mischievous* that a Christian ought to forswear political power and rights, and in so

far, mischievous to hold that the devil is the immediate source of this power, we did not pronounce the latter to be an *ungodly** and *wicked* opinion, which would seem to imply impiety in those who hold it. What we do regard as *ungodly* is, that the Brethren should force upon others their tenet about political disfranchisement, as one main test of their Christian character. This Brother will not deny, that whoever interprets the New Testament herein differently from them, they pronounce to be *worldly*. 'Union with 'the world,' with them means very chiefly, the retaining and exercising political † rights; and though most of them see that Paul must be the first person condemned, they do not shrink from this haughty conduct.

But be the sentiment ungodly or otherwise, it is not seldom professed, without incurring reproof, by many of the brethren; while *all* hold the practical inference from it, which is the main thing for which we care. In the Christian Witness, vol. vi. p. 66, we read: 'Satan has in his power (*subject indeed to an overruling control*) the kingdoms of the earth during this age, 'and no longer. He is only the prince of this world for a time; 'but he is termed even the god of this world. The world and 'its kingdoms *will be* redeemed into the possession of the Lord 'of the whole earth, &c. . . . (Note) I do not think that Satan 'rightfully had the kingdoms of the world when he offered them 'to the Lord: [I think] that he was not *at that time* prince of 'the world; and *only became so by the world having rejected 'Christ.*' Again, ch. iv. vol. v. pp. 2, 3: 'Does the world belong 'to Christ or Satan? *This is a question of immense practical 'concern, as involving our present standing and relationship both 'to God and the world.* There is no question it belongs to Christ 'in title and in right, for all things were made by him and for 'him, &c. . . . But in this dispensation of long-suffering, there is 'no visible assertion of that right, *nor any exercise of it for the 'right ordering of the world.* Such an assumption of direct control, we learn expressly from Rev. xi. 15, 17, 18, to be yet 'future, &c. . . . The devil had claimed the power of this world 'in his approach to Christ as the tempter, and *our Lord was far 'from denying the fact.* Nay, in the progress of his rejection, 'he could himself own him to be the prince of this world, &c. &c. 'The Scriptures relative to these facts have been largely opened 'for our instruction in the WITNESS, and they have no doubt by

* Opinions may be either true or false, but they are not in any strictness godly or ungodly. To call an opinion *ungodly*, could only mean (we apprehend) that the holding it is a mark of ungodliness.

† It is not merely the exercising them *ill* to which they object (for who does not?), but to exercising them *at all*: to the being linked in a 'worldly system.'

‘this time become familiar to us.’ Afterwards, p. 5, at bottom: ‘The relation and intercourse subsisting between wicked spirits and ourselves, *involves much more than a mere influence over our hearts*, though that indeed is most pernicious. Their active personal interference in the concerns of the world, it would be most injurious for us to overlook; for assuredly it is real.’ We believe the writer is maintaining the reality of physical miracles wrought by devils; for he is discussing Rev. xiv. 13, 14. But it is more to our purpose to insist, that he deduces from the fact, that the devil is prince of the world, the practical inference that we may not exercise political rights or authority, which is what we asserted. If we understand the above, it is shortly thus: ‘Christ is king *de jure*, but exercises no direct power; the devil is king *de facto*, and in the real exercise of power; therefore all political office is unlawful to a Christian.’ But we proceed to Mr. Hall. It is difficult to quote from so exceedingly diffuse a writer, but we must attempt it. In ‘Discipleship,’ p. 34, he is arguing from the text, ‘that which is highly esteemed* among men, is abomination in the sight of God,’ whence he deduces, that God abominates rank, and therefore no Christian ought to retain it. It is not the *misuse* of rank or authority merely, but *the thing itself* which God hates, according to him. This convinces us that Mr. Hall does not hold God to be in any *direct* sense the author and ordainer of it, however he may deceive himself by the phraseology, ‘ordained of God.’ Again, p. 41, he says; ‘Love has taught him (Mr. H.) to count the cost; and in truth he can say, it is sufficient for him to be as his Master: *how then can he retain a commission of authority, when the source of its power is the darkness of the world?* God knows it is not in harshness, &c. &c., that this is said,’ &c. Mr. H.’s complaint is not that it was an abuse of power to put *him* into office; he objects to the power, barely *because its source is bad*. He proceeds: ‘There are but two channels of authority, the power of the world, and God’s ordained servants, the ministers of his Spirit. If I were of the world, it should be well that I should hold of the former; if the grace of my God has translated me *out* of it into his kingdom, to be led of the Spirit is not only my privilege, but I should err in holding power from *another*,’ &c. &c. No doubt, after this, Mr. H. adds warnings to prevent it from being thought that he is a radical or a regicide, bowing himself to the sovereign as to ‘God’s anointed,’ and declaring

* On a recent occasion, the writer had a long discussion with a much esteemed (Plymouth) Brother, who, on the ground of this text, maintained unflinchingly, that *God abhors natural talents*. Of course it proves this, if it proves Mr. Hall’s point. The context seems to demand the rendering, ‘That which exalteth itself among men,’ &c. &c.

that 'power is of God, and *not of the people*;' [not of the *devil*, would be more to our purpose;] which passage is now quoted by this Brother, as convicting us of falsehood! Truly, it may prove that Mr. Hall is an ultra Tory, who (under the belief of that religion demands it), inculcates political principles subversive of the existing constitution of this realm; but so far it entirely supports and does not contradict our statements. Indeed, nearly all this Brother's quotations are to no purpose; for they do but re-echo certain phrases of Scripture, while the real question is, how those phrases are interpreted—'All power is of God,' 'ordained of God,' &c.

We must here go a little deeper. Two classes of things are ordained by God. First, all the moral relationships; marriage, family ties, social duties; private rights—the right to one's own body, and to the fruit of one's own labor: mutual duties of Christians. These things so emanate from the will of God, that we count them therefore good, because ordained by him. A Christian errs greatly, who thinks himself 'too holy' for the marriage tie, or for menial service; for that true virtue to which he is called, consists in rightly performing all these common duties. But, secondly, God also ordains the calamities and the minor trials of the physical world, the fierceness of beasts, the power of banditti, the revolutions of empires. *All these are to work together for good* to the Christian; yet he never infers that they are therefore intrinsically good because God has ordained them; nor is any moral or holy relationship found in any of these things. We have often heard some of the Brethren entitle the former, ordinances of God's grace; the latter, ordinances of his providence.

Our question is, To which of these does civil authority belong? If to the former, then obviously the relationship of ruler and subject, is very similar to that of master and servant, or parent and child. In *all* such relationships we must obey God rather than man. If a child is ordered to steal or lie, he must disobey; if a servant be employed as an instrument of profligacy, he must leave his place; and so must a civil magistrate, if ordered to assist in idolatry. But no servant who leaves a wicked master, is right in denouncing the post of a master (or of a servant), as one intrinsically unlawful to a Christian; nor, by analogy, is it right to teach, that a Christian may not be a responsible officer, higher or lower, barely because many rulers misconduct themselves; and much less, *if any* (as these Brethren) *disavow their right to judge of the conduct of rulers.* (p. 508, l. 40.)

That Mr. Hall, and all his party, should disown this analogy, appears absolutely required by their arguments. We do not find that they vindicate magistracy, as a *righteous institution*, founded on mutual benefit; the superior giving protection, the inferior

repaying it with honor and service; and we are sure that many of them (as the above quotations show), are strongly opposed to this view. Mr. H. represents a Christian as wholly *passive* towards the government. If commanded, he submits; if ill-treated, he endures it; if taxes be demanded, he gives them. A Christian servant pays *active* service to his master, by voluntary zeal even supplying what has been forgotten to be commanded: but a Christian subject (they hold) becomes a *worldly character*, if he display a desire to benefit the community by any voluntary exertions. Mr. H. enforces the duty of submission to the magistrate, not by insisting on his abstract moral claims on our help (which is St. Paul's argument), but by the dry appeal to authority: the Scripture has commanded it!—the same reason which he would urge for submission to a robber. It appears to us therefore most clear, that Mr. H. (though perhaps unconscious of it through want of mental analysis), does *not* hold magistracy as co-ordinate with the other social relations,—as an appointment of God's grace, intrinsically righteous,—but as collateral with the ordinances of Providence, hurricanes or revolutions, under which we are to be resigned, with full belief that they are permitted for our good; and that the theory which is implicated in his arguments, degrades civil authority. At the same time, the Brother who writes in the Inquirer, asserts (and quotes to the same effect), that, 'As *holders* of power, magistrates 'are the ordinance of God; though in their *use* of power, they 'may be the servants of the devil.' The words *may be* are highly significant, and if followed to their just results, obviously destroy the Brethren's whole system. But as the Brother agrees to all Mr. H.'s practical inferences, this sound principle is an idle theory with him.

Through some want of attention, he has understood us to say, that we 'should be subject to a cut-throat, *if by God's permission* 'our ruler, only for wrath, and not for conscience' sake:' but the words in italics are his own insertion, and utterly reverse our sentiment. As he pointedly asks one question, we reply—that 'in Nero's days' we should have thought it our duty to obey, to suffer, to bleed; revolution would have been a guilty lottery, issuing at best in a change of masters. We think that it is in *moral* force that the strength of Christians lies; and that it would be in us an ungrateful return to God's mercy, to make light of the blessings of English citizenship. If unrighteously invaded, we may legally and boldly defend them, as Paul defended his Roman citizenship. This Brother most unjustifiably pretends, that we are offended because the Brethren will not use swaggering and insolent language towards the government; he treats us as promoters and lovers of *rebellion*, who are barely kept down by force! Truly the Quakers, with whom we contrasted the Brethren, are not wont to bluster;

nor does any one fear their muskets and pikes. Is this Brother so staunch a Tory, as to be unable to conceive of such a thing moral influence upon political measures? Does he imagine that all the affairs of nations are determined by bribery and physical force? We, on the contrary, believe that a nation which contends for the rights of others, by words of truth with disinterested zeal, strengthens its own liberties thereby, better than could be done by successful insurrection.

Yet we do not believe that Rom. xiii. was written to dissuade Christians from seeking to promote a political revolution. Since the failure of Brutus, it had become clear to every man of intelligence, that the Roman empire afforded no materials for any thing but a despotism; and it is quite unlikely that Christians should have conceived the idea, and that Paul should have needed to check them. And had he done so, it could not have been by such reasonings as he uses. For instance, of what avail would it have been to plead *the important uses and benefits of magistracy*, in order to dissuade the Whigs of 1688 from ejecting that *bad* magistrate James II.? Such an argument must have been directed against those who looked on magistracy as only 'the law of the stronger;'—a familiar opinion in Greece;—or, as a violation of Messiah's higher authority; in which latter light it would occur to Jewish Christians and their disciples. Against such the apostle vindicates it as a righteous and useful institution, to which their own conscience ought to teach them the duty of submitting.

Now we maintain, that, among 'the ordinances of man, to which we are to be subject for the Lord's sake,' is that ordinance which invests many Christians with the political franchise, and some few with a peerage; and that a Christian's duty is to exercise this, 'as to the Lord, and not unto men:' setting to all men an example of incorruptibility, justice, truth, candor; with a view to which, a certain knowledge of public affairs is to be sought after. If circumstances prevent this, it is better to give no vote, than to give it at hazard; but no Christian is justified in the course pursued by these Brethren, of condemning all as 'worldly,' who seek the present good of their fellow-men by means which God has ordained. What sort of vituperation would be heaped on *us*, if we made in any thing else as little of Paul's opinion and judgment, as these Brethren make of it in the matter of worldly citizenship? At Philippi, at Jerusalem, at Cæsarea (after two years' imprisonment for meditation on his former act), this apostle deliberately repeats that which they so condemn in us. He counted himself still a citizen of this world; so do we count ourselves. There is not a hint in the Scripture to imply that Paul sinned in this matter. Surely a little modesty or candor might make them suspect, that when Paul's *conduct* appears to them so erroneous,

they probably misunderstand his *doctrine* also. Moreover, when he has broadly laid down that magistracy is a righteous institution, according with the will of God, it is evident that the burden of proof rests with those who say that no Christian can lawfully be a magistrate. This Brother, and all his party, urge that there are no directions in Scripture how a Christian is to conduct himself as a magistrate—as though that made it unlawful! But in this, as in most other matters, our controversy with them is concerning the laws of interpretation, of which we shall speak presently.

We profess to this Brother, that we regard his party to be peculiarly reprehensible, as practical promoters of oppression. They have not the excuse of ecclesiastical Tories,—many of them most deeply sincere persons,—who so dread the loss of the Church Establishment, that, to support this, they forget every thing else; for the Brethren hold the Establishment to be a prodigious and most evil fiction. Yet they throw all their *moral influence* on that side, which has for a length of time past favoured oppression and iniquity, bloody and lasting wars, grinding taxation, burdensome restrictions, church jobs, a cruel administration of cruel laws, colonial slavery, and Indian misgovernment.

If all English Christians held the views of these Brethren, the negroes of our colonies would still be treated as cattle, and far worse: and does Christ forbid us to utter our voice to our rulers against these enormities? Was it right to drink our coffee and sugar,—the blood of these men!—and plead conscientious scruples against petitioning for their release? and this, when it is notorious that our rulers themselves, unsupported by the moral power of the nation's voice, are unable to effect beneficial reforms which they may earnestly desire? Truly this Brother greatly mistakes, in supposing that we are secretly ashamed and afraid to avow our deep disapproval of this baneful sentiment of theirs.

But we cannot allow it to appear as though the question between them and us were one of mere party. The Brother would have it believed, that solely because this Review upholds reforming or 'radical' sentiments, do we object to their doctrines. It is not so. Radicals, Whigs, Tories, all alike repudiate the notion, that a Christian may not be a magistrate or a watchman; all alike regard it as a monstrous idea, that he may not help in improving the laws of the realm, or the public welfare and organization of the community; that he may not exercise the franchise or the right of petitioning. We have on our side all the good and great men, through whose exertions these Brethren now possess the gospel, the Scriptures, and freedom of conscience; and, first and greatest, we have the apostle of the Gentiles.

This Brother does not deny, but tacitly confirms what we

stated—that they hold it wrong to seek to improve the outward condition of the world. Their sentiments must lead to this, for social, civil, and political relations are not separable by any intelligible principle. May I not be a member of parliament?—may I then be a member of a town council? May I not be lord chancellor?—may I then be a commissioner of tithes or bankrupts?—or may I sit on a jury? May I not be conductor of the Post Office?—may I then be an excise officer? May I not sit in the privy council?—may I then be a member of an agricultural society? If it were right to produce individual cases, we could prove that leading Brethren well understand how far their doctrine must carry them, and do not shrink from it. One thing indeed is yet to come—the believing it unlawful to receive interest on money, or rents of estates. Certainly landed property has its duties, and must put them in a false position.

We have dwelt very long on the head of Political Rights and Duties, both from its own importance, and from the stress which the Brother laid on it. When he regards our statements here as ‘utterly false’ (p. 508), the reader may judge with what sort of discrimination he has declared, that we make out our case ‘per fas aut nefas,’ and teach that ‘the means are sanctified by the end.’

II. Perhaps next in importance is the tenet of Open Ministry. This Brother before accused us of pretending that it consisted only in having a great *number* of teachers. When he comes to our explanation, that the main point of it is, not to put undue constraint on the energies of the Holy Spirit, he takes an opposite objection, that we unduly confound them with the Quakers. This, of course, was maliciously intended by us to imply, that the Brethren, as the Quakers, hold the Spirit to supersede and take precedence of the written word! (pp. 500—502.) Indeed, we referred to the Quakers solely as being a well known sect. But we were speaking of Church *Order*, not on the mode of ascertaining truth. Our words were, ‘Namely, that the Spirit is still ‘given to the Church in so emphatic and peculiar a mode, as to ‘make all Church *Arrangements* for edification unlawful.’ [We did not say, ‘As to be paramount to the evidence of the written ‘word.’] ‘They do not attack bad organization, but organization ‘as such.’ The Brother objects, first, that he cannot understand the phrase *emphatic and peculiar*; which, he seems to suspect, conceals something wrong. We reply, that we wanted to avoid a verbal discussion about ordinary and extraordinary, miraculous or nonmiraculous gifts; and thought to do so best, by stating the result and effects, not the essence of these gifts; viz. that they supersede Pre-arrangement; indeed, render it unlawful. Next, he thinks we, rather craftily, confound arrangement and organization. Indeed, we regard the latter as somewhat more permanent than the

former. But what should we gain by this craft? For, thirdly, the Brother here declares that he approves solely 'of the Divine organization of the Spirit, and not that of modern churches,' p. 500; which of course must be meant to avow and defend the opinion which we ascribed to them: otherwise it would be a wretched quibble. But farther, he thinks we unduly confound them with the Quakers, when we represent it to be decided which of the Brethren shall speak, by the 'moving of the Spirit on the heart;' whereby (he says) we throw out of sight that they believe gift and qualification permanently to reside in individuals. So far from it, that we believe the Quakers to hold the same opinion. Not every Quaker is a John Joseph Gurney. We many times spoke of their 'leading men,' and represented them as holding, that 'the Spirit is eminently in the few.' Observing, however, that the Brother again corrects this last expression, and wishes we had said, 'All gift and qualification for rule are ever in a few;' we have certainly been struck at this sensitiveness, and are led to inquire whether his notions of the influences of the Spirit differ so much from those generally acknowledged, as their phraseology has seemed to us to imply. Indeed, but for their views of the uselessness or mischievousness of mental culture, and the sinfulness of *all* error, we should incline to this opinion. If on this head we still misunderstand and misrepresent our Brother, we assure him it is unwillingly and inadvertently.

But let us hear his own account of open ministry. Note, p. 495. 'The real meaning of exclusive and of open ministry, is, I believe, generally little understood. It might not be the will of the Lord for a number of years to raise up in a Christian church more than one individual qualified to minister in the word. If, however, there was an open door left meanwhile for any upon whom it might please the Lord to bestow ability to minister his gift for the common profit, this would not be exclusive ministry. *But if in another church the ministry of the word were extended even to ten or twenty members, and then arbitrarily limited to that number, this would be that exclusive ministry which the Scripture calls SCHISM: 1 Cor. xii.*'

We should have feared to state the case so very strongly, lest it might appear exaggerated; but the Brother does not shrink from it. To reason with him may seem hopeless, when he is amazed that we regard this distinction as a trifle, in comparison with the peace of churches and brotherly moderation. We feel very strongly upon it, and spoke strongly. Because he cannot conceive of the depth of our feelings concerning it, he taxes us with levity; we might say, with profanity. But again we must appeal to our readers.

Do ministers of the New Testament spring up in a night? or are they gradually matured by time and exercise? We suppose,

from this Brother's language, that he holds the latter; but we do not know. Even if the former were true, it would not quench nor grieve the Spirit, to order that certain persons alone speak *in a certain building* and at a certain time. For if others were gifted, ever so suddenly, they would find, in another building, and to another audience, the opportunity of using their gifts. Who now advocates what Queen Elizabeth did,—the trying “to stop prophesyings” by outward force? Let the new prophets or teachers speak elsewhere: if their powers are remarkable, the church whence they came will hear of it, and can, if it please, make room for them. Its ordinances are not immoveable, as of the Medes and Persians.—How much less then is an insult offered to the Spirit by the regulation supposed, if it be believed that ministers and teachers are not formed without time? This regulation may be *wise*, or *unwise*: that is not our question. But, have the Brethren a right to dogmatize, as they do, about it?—to call all churches apostate which judge otherwise?

This word “Apostate” is intended to have, and has, a real sting: it is not equivalent to *misjudging*. For, consider how the Brother deals towards churches which do not assent to his strange interpretation of 1 Cor. xii. 25, and his application of the whole chapter. He decides, first, they have left the apostolic model; secondly, they are apostate—their order is fleshly order, their union an insult to the Spirit; thirdly, he does not recognise the relationship between a pastor and his flock, or between church-members, as a spiritual reality, however truly cemented by the Spirit; but as mere fleshly formality. He would rejoice at its destruction. If the ten or twenty ministers were persuaded suddenly to abandon the flock and join the Brethren, would not this Brother glorify God that ‘they had come out of all systems,’ without asking whether the ties broken were spiritual, or merely formal? This is what we meant by saying that they did not care ‘what spiritual* ties they burst, while pressing their theories:’ for is not this quite a refinement of theory?

He corrects an assertion of ours, which implied that it is not lawful for an individual to collect *believers* (suppose to his own house) in order that he might teach them himself, and be the sole speaker. Our words certainly contained this, although we had only intended them as an emphatic re-asserting of the duty of open ministry, whenever they met *as believers*; which we believe is identical (in the Brethren's view) with meeting *as a church*. This Brother, however, says that open ministry is to be enforced only ‘when they meet as a church *for the worship of God*.’ We gladly publish this more correct statement of their

* The Brother seems to think we meant *ecclesiastical*.

views; although we cannot conceive how 1 Cor. xii. authorizes them in this limitation. May not a church, if it please, meet for the mere worship of God, without having, at such time, any ministry at all?

If, as this Brother appears to think, their open ministry *works well*, we do not grudge it them, but are glad to have this and other methods put to the proof. Yet we think it clear, that an *unfair* advantage is given to the system, in a picked and therefore sectarian church. While the differences between speakers lie within narrow limits, so long (and only so long) are they bearable. But let the doctrine of Wesley (to give but one instance) be broached before the Brethren; let it be periodically and permanently enforced; and we are confident that they will either silence it—by persuasion, entreaty, authority; or they will quit the church themselves.

We know they will say, that this difficulty, though great, is hypothetical; and that their faith is exercised in looking to be kept out of it, as much as to be helped *through it*; nay, and hitherto have been so! We cannot allow this writer the triumph implied in his thankfulness for their unanimity; for it is plain that they have employed the surest *human means* for suppressing differences *WITHIN* their church. These are two: first, by using great strength (we say, exaggeration) of sentiment, which disgusts and repels all who do not embrace it; to which also their general intolerance of contrary opinions conduces: secondly, by securing that the chief power of mind should rest on their side. Their plan of proceeding is available to propagate truth or error alike. Some half-dozen men of education, and of energetic minds, coalesce, and assemble round them a number of females and of less educated men. Individuals who combine with them become assimilated to the pre-existing body; for a person remaining neutral and calm in the midst of them would be as a chill to their fervour, and in perpetual collision. If all (true) Christians joined them instantly—as they fancy they wish—their system would prove impracticable. But because all who disagree with them either keep away through kindness, or are driven away by disapprobation,—that is, because they are a sect, and *not* the catholic church, therefore alone it is that open ministry succeeds. Still, *in a sect*, and cleared from enthusiasm, it may be a very useful institution, for any thing that we are concerned to maintain.

III. We will next advert to an instance (p. 503) of his misapprehending us in a rather grave matter. Because we said that the Brethren held the law of Moses not to be our rule of life ‘in any sense whatever,’ he thinks that we are charging them with Antinomianism! Now in fact, not a feature which we have ascribed to the Brethren has any similarity to that odious error; and we particularly stated that their ‘Calvinism was very moderate.’

It is the more remarkable, because this is one of the tenets which the writer of the former Article held 'to involve valuable truth;' and in a note upon their view of the Sabbath, in connexion with it, may be read: 'This is no peculiarity of theirs; *since it was held by all the Reformers, as well as in all times by the most learned writers of the Church of England.*' Did it need much study to discern that the writer agreed with them? Suspecting there might be a strong feeling against this among his coadjutors, he did not feel justified in using the editorial *We*; and yet (considering it to be a doctrine on which few use discrimination), he could not endure to permit it to bring odium on the Brethren, without stating, though dryly, a fact tending to disarm hostility. How the Brother, with that note before him, could suppose Antinomianism to be the thing imputed, it is difficult to say. But what did we mean by *in any sense whatever*? Merely, that *as a rule*, it was gone by entirely and for ever; and not (as some distinguish) a rule in moral matters, but not in ceremonial; or a rule of conduct, but not of justification, &c. &c. The Brother fully accepts for himself the sentiments which we described; but tells us that they are not altogether unanimous, while we had said 'we believed' they were.

IV. He complains that we 'insinuate what we dare not assert,' that they lay claim to the gifts of prophecy. We assure him that we insinuate no such thing. We desired, as concisely as we could, to point out the contrast between the Irvingites and the Brethren; the former holding that miraculous gifts *have* come and are *present*—the latter, that they are to be desired, prayed for, looked after, but are not (to their knowledge) come. We are certain that this used to be held by the Brethren, and not very long back; nor do we find that this Brother repudiates it. But, as we before said, he makes us suspect that their views concerning the Spirit have been modified. Perhaps they now think that no more gifts (in kind) are to be expected or prayed for, than they actually have at present.

Speaking of insinuations, we will add two other matters. He complains that we insinuated that they are *not* anxious to proselyte souls *to Christ*; because we spoke of their 'zeal to proselyte persons, not to Christ, but to a new system.' We cannot withdraw this statement: nay, we believe they will glory in it, changing the word *system*. But that we did not intend the alleged insinuation, might be seen by our broad statement, that they held they ought 'to preach the gospel, feed the hungry, &c.' In case any of our readers have not attended to this, we here distinctly disavow any such meaning. It would be very unworthy to imagine that no better motive than party zeal prompts their efforts to enlighten the ignorant and convert the abandoned.

Farther, when we spoke of 'pews or no pews,' as a thing on

which they lay inordinate stress (as we deliberately think), we were not intending to beguile the reader into the belief that it was the mere pew, and not the moral principle of a private pew, to which they objected. We ourselves twice said, '*private pews*' and '*payment for pews.*' Those congregations with which we are acquainted, would object, as strongly as the Brethren can, to allow poor members to be excluded from convenient sittings, by the rich monopolizing them.

V. Another grand accusation. We hold in our hands a paper, which we believe has been widely circulated, entitled, 'Some Explanation of the Views of certain Brethren in Christ.' Therein we read: 'We hold that *no difference of judgment* or 'experience ought to hinder communion and visible unity among 'those who *love* our Lord Jesus in sincerity.' This is a statement which, we feel satisfied, the Brother will approve: as will all Congregationalists, except Strict Communion Baptists. Yet this principle is really more barren than it seems. At first sight, it appears to say, that a man's creed is *not* one of the elements by which we decide whether or not he loves the Lord; but that other means exist by which this may be known, and that, this having been ascertained, his creed goes for nothing. This sounds delightfully large: our hearts open towards it with desire,—we speak most seriously. We believe it is painful to every generous mind, to be brought back to the conviction that it is not possible to act up to it; but that there *are* points which, even as a bare creed, must be exacted. When this is allowed, it is clear that the proposition should be: 'No difference of judgment, *which is not* 'such as to induce the belief that an individual does *not* love, ' &c. &c.'; in which form it loses all its pleasant generality, and says no more than 'common dissenters' hold.

We remarked in our former article, on the appearance of 'liberalism or liberality' in the Brethren, which came to nothing in practice; and this was meant as an eminent instance of it. They find great fault with all others for enforcing creeds, confessions, &c., and loudly proclaim, (as something forsooth peculiar to themselves,) that 'no difference of judgment should hinder communion,' &c. Yet this, when checked by a second principle, is stripped of its grandeur. We exhibited the two propositions as follows:—

Every person claiming admission into a church must be received, *if* he is a partaker of the Spirit, be his opinions what they may.—

The wise and eminently spiritual may detect that a person is *not* partaker of the Spirit, by some deficiency in the Articles of his Creed.

The former is only that which we quoted above, with a slight change of grammar, and the word *opinion* put for *judgment*. We

have heard this proposition in a great variety of forms, and will not contest with the Brother which is best; for instance, that 'Nothing is to be inquired into, but the possession of the common life;' or, in Scripture language, 'We are to receive all whom Christ has received.' Now, (will our readers believe it?) this Brother actually repudiates indignantly the former of our two propositions; and next, accepting the latter as true, declares that we contradict ourselves! He says, 'First, a person may be a partaker of the Spirit, *be his opinions what they may*; and next, 'he may be proved not to have the Spirit, *by a defect in his Creed!*' Against such stupidity (we must use this term, as we would not think it wilfulness) it is indeed hard to contend. He quotes as our words, which we never used; viz., 'A person *may be partaker,*' &c.; which it would be utterly false to impute to the brethren. We used* two hypothetical clauses, *if* he be 'partaker,' and '*be his opinions what they may*;' and this is what the Brethren themselves say, and what, we doubt not, this very Brother has often eagerly pressed. Certainly, before he charges us with falsehood, he ought to ascertain the difference between saying, 'No difference of judgment ought to separate those who love the Lord,' and, '*If* any love the Lord, they ought not to separate, *be their difference of judgment what it may.*'

Let it observed now, that the Brother leaves without remark the following sentiment, which we ascribed to them, though he closely criticises those on each side of it: 'It is unlawful to lay down any creed, as a test of communion, or as a test for ministers;' which we likewise stated in pp. 575, 583. Why does he not again tell us, that we are confuting ourselves? For (he might urge), 'First, a man may be detected as unspiritual, and justly rejected from the church, for a defect in his creed; and next, 'No creed may be laid down as a test for communion!' The inconsistency is theirs, not ours.

Believing, as we do, that their talk of imposing no creed is self-delusion, and that they really impose a precise one unawares—being remarkably unable to endure intellectual differences—we much wish that they would draw out a creed. It would then appear whether or not such articles as these must be believed, in order to admission to their church, 'It is contrary to our Christian profession to retain the rights of worldly citizenship;' and various others which we might name. But few notions, we believe, are more inveterately fixed in their imaginations, than the abstract wrong of test articles. Meanwhile, we must again

* Thus if the order were given, 'Admit any genuine Englishman, be the color of his skin what it may,' the Brother might allege that this was to assert, that 'a man may be a genuine Englishman, and yet be as black as a negro.'

beg it may be observed, the Brother formally acknowledges that *some* creed or other is to be exacted, though he does not say *what*.

VI. We proceed to a kindred subject. We have given as among their current doctrines, to deprecate distinguishing between fundamental and non-fundamental truths. This is in fact an immediate deduction from the unlawfulness of Creeds, and *as such we represented it*. The Brother now opposes us by a very interesting passage, p. 595 (which we would quote had we space), on Unanimity, Uniformity, and the distinction of Fundamental truths. Only it sneers at 'Creeds, Catechisms, and Confessions;' which in this connection is strange enough, for the whole scope of it is really to prove the lawfulness or necessity of a Creed, so that it be a right one. But we beg to add this to the number of our 'paradoxes,' to hold that *they*,* and not *we*, are here, as elsewhere, inconsistent.

Let us suppose a conversation between ourselves and a Brother (the substance of the following has more than once actually passed). 'What is the Creed held by your church?—It is not our place to make Creeds; we hold it to be an undue assumption, and contrary to the mind of Christ.—But do not you hold *any* truths to be essential? would you admit a deist who seemed to be spiritual?—Oh! no: we would not.—It being then conceded that not all opinions or doctrines are admissible; if you *do not* know which are fundamental, what right have you to exercise church discipline and authority concerning such matters? but if you *do* know, is it not the duty of the church to instruct men in it? or am I really to understand that you know, but will not tell?' When the conversation reaches this point, they† uniformly deprecate the attempt to divide truths into fundamental and non-fundamental, saying that it tends to disparage the latter, and more to that effect. And without for a moment impeaching the sincerity of this writer, we cannot get rid of the belief that he also would do the same. The texture of the logic is too close to admit of any other refuge. At the same time, we gave it to be understood, that they did not try to act on this

* If this Brother, or any of them, will plainly admit that it *is* right to draw up and impose a Creed, we at once withdraw this.

† This Brother imagines we have heard them do so, when they meant to urge the "heartless ingratitude" of making light of the latter. We think it a very grave error to suppose truth to be unimportant, because not fundamental; but perhaps as grave, *so* to urge on persons that which is not fundamental, as to make them feel that there is no Christian sympathy or comfort for them, until their judgment be convinced. We here add, that we are satisfied we have read in one of their books, the statement formally made, that no one ought to mark off truth thus into two parts; but we cannot lay our hand on it, and indeed are unconcerned so to do.

theory (for as such it must be regarded), for it is indivisible from the explanation of Heresy which we ascribed to them, of which we added, it was 'a rule that could not be carried generally into effect.'

It is singular to see the art, or the simplicity with which the subject of Creeds is managed in the 'Answers to a Clergyman,' quoted by this Brother as exhibiting their views. The question is put, What are the Scripture Terms of Communion? and the reply is, 'A Confession of Faith in those truths, *the belief of which constitutes a person a Christian, but without faith in which a person cannot be a Christian;*' and this (i. e. faith) 'manifested by a righteous walk.' Thus, when asked, What must be believed for admission to the church? they reply, The things which must be believed for salvation: and decline all farther elucidation; which is about as useful as the Romish reply, The things which the Church believes. But this may show how vehemently they refuse to allow (in theory) the right of the Church to dictate a Creed, while they leave themselves at liberty to be really as exclusive as they please.

Lest some of our readers misinterpret our own views, we must distinctly say that nothing is farther from our thoughts than to approve of fixed, traditionary, unalterable Creeds, which it is unlawful to question. Churches, as individuals, being highly fallible, must not assume airs of infallibility; but since in this matter they are called to *act*, it may surely be demanded that they act publicly, and that truths believed to be essential to the validity of a Christian profession, should be distinctly recognized as the basis of union in a Christian church. The minds of individuals may be much exercised and well-informed on the subject, but we apprehend it seldom or never is pondered by the great majority. When any new case arises, the church has simultaneously to form its general principles, and to act upon them; of course under no small excitement, if they are deciding upon the Christianity of an individual. It is our opinion (at least, the opinion of the immediate writer), that every increase of general intelligence and activity of mind upon spiritual subjects, will make this difficulty more and more formidable.

VII. On another subject, the definition of Heresy, we freely confess that we have been hasty in attributing to the Brethren generally that which is probably only held by some individuals. We stated that they taught Heresy to be '*the choosing for oneself an opinion not according to the mind of the Spirit:*' and that a person holding it is to be excommunicated, *because* Heresy is 'a work of the flesh.' This certainly is no invention of ours. We know it to have been maintained by one very conspicuous person among them for years; and it is our full belief that we have read this definition and explanation of Heresy in the Chris-

tian Witness, though we have not now succeeded in finding it. We certainly gave a prominence to this in recapitulating, so as to imply that it was held by them *generally*. But this Brother informs us that at their Clifton meeting, in June, 1838, they judged Heresy to be 'the evil activity and restlessness of the 'flesh in using false views as an engine of division, &c.' This is later in time than that to which we refer, and we do not doubt that he has rightly corrected us. We are sorry to lessen the cordiality of such concession, by saying that with his usual want of discernment, he neglects to observe that we ourselves distinctly stated that they did not, and could not, *act* on this doctrine, except in isolated cases. 'Could the rule be carried generally 'into effect,' said we, 'it would split up the church, &c., &c.,' and then we proceeded to show that it was only in individual instances and on new comers that it would be exercised: and we see nothing in all this which we would wish altered. But the Brother formally argues out the impossibility of acting on such a definition of heresy, as if we had not already said the same thing.

But when he wishes us to believe that the Brethren would refer any case of this kind to the decision of the church, we are wholly unable to admit it. We deliberately reiterate all that we said concerning their determination to disavow the authority of the collected church, and their jealousy of its power. We know this as a fact; it is required by their sentiments; and it appears quite plainly in this Brother's own writing. He quotes the words (p. 508), 'It is for the brethren already in communion to decide according to the above tests, upon the title of 'those who propose themselves for communion:' which he contrasts with our words, 'Wisdom will be given to the few to 'judge of his character, but the sense of the church must by no 'means be taken.' *He omits our words which follow:* 'The 'church being always formed chiefly of babes and ignorant persons, must never vote *by the head* on such a matter.' This last omission was decidedly unfair, because he elsewhere (p. 504) admits that 'the sense of the church is not to be taken' by head-voting, which is the only thing of which we spoke; and he does not explain in what other way they proceed, when the church is not unanimous. Not but that we believe *every kind* of authority in the church is disowned by them. There is an unfair ambiguity in the words *according to the above tests*; for one of the tests is, that the candidates be sound on 'fundamental 'truths;' and this Brother's own extracts declare that the church may not set forth a declaration, *what* truths are fundamental: so that no test is really proposed. Suppose now a candidate for admission, who in other opinions agrees with their church, but who disbelieves the doctrine of *Preventing* grace as held by

Calvinists, or the strict eternity of future punishments ; the real question is, whether the leading brethren will submit to the decision of the church, should it happen to be against their own. We can see nothing in this Brother's writing to make us suspect that *he* would : and we are personally confident that many of them would not. Nay, he has not ventured to reject this statement of ours, ' If any Brother in his public teaching, utter that which is false or unedifying, those who are wise must reprove him, and he must submit to them. For we are ordered to be subject one to another. And if he do not submit, they must reject him as a heretic, after a first and second admonition.'

But indeed, no other course is open to those who condemn democracy in the church, who forbid even that a congregation shall choose its pastors, and yet refuse all fixed official authority. It must remain that strong-willed individuals be uncontrolled, as much in censuring and excluding from the church, and in other public acts, as in their private capacity. We do not dissemble the *difficulties* of democracy in the church. St. Paul found them at Corinth. But these Brethren are deluded, if they suppose that their own system is any thing else. There is no middle thing (such as they dream of) between formal and informal church order. An amalgamation of the two may exist, but nothing differing in kind from both. The formal, which recognizes official authority to decide things spiritual—as, who shall teach, or what shall be taught—they repudiate : the informal can be nothing but the democratic system, viz. 'a legal equality of all ;' in which, consequently, there is no rule but that of opinion, no influence but that of persuasion, or perhaps, blustering. Tell us not of gifts. It suffices not to have such gifts as Paul, *unless the possessor is believed by others to have them.** The apostle John was overpowered by the influence of Diotrephes. When therefore the Brethren impotently condemn the democracy of dissenters, they only show their love of finding fault ; or else, a miserable desire of irresponsible power. This is like the old giant 'Pope' in Bunyan, who, being chained, could do nothing but show his teeth. The utmost that he can obtain, is a sort of Arab despotism, which may exercise any acts of power on those without, so long as it is lenient, and upholds its popularity with those within the tribe.

* In the *Christian Witness*, vol. v. p. 81, it is confessed that the democratic system appeared almost immediately on the departure of the apostles ; but this is treated as a manifest and grievous error—natural in a high churchman, but absurd and self-contradictory in one who will not allow that the Apostles had any formal successors, and who holds that it is the duty of each Christian to prove and try every one who calls himself a minister of Christ. The truth is, that Paul's own system was democratic. Only *his personal qualifications* sustained his authority in the churches ; and he says, ' If we or an angel from heaven, &c.'

It might now seem needless to answer the Brother in the Inquirer, who adduces the text, 'Obey them which have the rule 'over you,' as a condemnation of democracy in the church. Does he know what 'democracy' means? perhaps, being a Tory, he supposes the word to mean 'tumult.' But we believe that *he* expounds that text, as all other Protestant Dissenters do; viz. that, 'after judging, as best we may, *who are* the persons to 'whom we are to be subject, then we are to obey them *within* 'reasonable and lawful limits.'

Before leaving this head, we must notice a fictitious contradiction which this Brother advances, by making us assert that which we did not.* His words are (p. 504): 'The Brethren 'frequently take the judgment of the assembled church on *many* 'subjects, *though they are here said to hold it unlawful.* They find no difficulty in doing this, *without putting the matter to the* 'vote.' He does but confirm all that we stated; viz. that the opinion of the church is *not to be taken by vote.* In the same page (p. 577) we wrote, *vote 'by the head,'* using marks of quotation to show upon what the stress was laid by the Brethren. He has also omitted our expression, 'on any spiritual subject,' which was here important; for we are not aware that the Brethren object to voting on other questions; for instance, as to the locality of their meeting room; and we were careful not to impute it.

VIII. It remains to speak on literature and mental cultivation. This Brother informs us that they allow of the study of the original languages of the Scripture, but disapprove of literature. He speaks of *philology, rhetoric, &c.* as condemned in Scripture (note to p. 503), and again (p. 514), gives us insight into the breadth of his prohibition thus: 'The Brethren object to *world-* 'liness, whether religious or otherwise; and regard politics, 'literature, exclusive ministry, &c., as so many forms of it.' We beg to call our readers' attention to the portentous *et cætera.*

We were *not* ignorant of this distinction, yet we must justify him in supposing that we were; and both to correct misapprehension in the reader's mind, and for the importance of the thing itself, we are glad to recur to it now. Embarrassed by the multiplicity of subjects, we not only did not give this distinction its deserved prominence, but certainly wrote one sentence in forgetfulness of it. Yet we know not how to make to the Brethren an

* Not to omit what is yet unimportant enough, we add that the Brother corrects an ill-formed sentence of ours which certainly represented them as thinking it right to break bread *several times* on the Lord's day, if the church met several times (p. 576). They think once is enough, but that it should be at least as often as once on every Lord's day, that is, once a week. This is what we had ourselves intended.

apology worth giving or receiving, since the substitution of the words 'Philology and History,' for 'Hebrew and Greek, will leave the point of our remark as sharp as before: viz., that in theory they despise, but in practice seek to use, these things. An unfortunate misprint of 'unlawful' for *lawful* (p. 578, l. 15), and the popular phrase 'Latin and Greek,' used for *ancient literature*, made our meaning yet more indistinct. Let us beg, at the end of this long article, for yet a little more patience, while we develop the meaning and result of the doctrine taught by the Brethren, that to study the bare languages of Scripture is right for a Christian, but to cultivate the mind is wrong.

We must explain what, in our last quotation from the Brother, is 'religious worldliness;' and it may illustrate to him what we meant by saying that they judge the Scriptures by other than the common laws of grammar;—words which he does not understand. *We* are used to speak of the religious world, or the Christian world, or the Protestant world, as freely as of the musical world or the mineral world; and judged by common grammar, all are equally good. But the Brother decides that *the Christian world*, is a contradiction; being, it seems, equivalent to *worldly Christians!* He three times attacks us about it, as in the note, p. 515: 'There is 'nothing self-contradictory in the expression *religious world*, for 'man is naturally *religious*; but that of *Christian world* is sadly 'anomalous, and like popular phrases, fearfully expressive of the 'existing state of things. Surely it was never intended that the 'terms *Christian* and *world* should be named together, save in 'the way of *contrast*, or meet together save in the way of *conflict*. 'And yet they are now found joined together in all *seeming* harmony.'

We are afraid to call this a specimen of 'divine grammar,' for it really might be mistaken for profanity. But is it not miserable to see religious feeling degenerate into this mawkish sensibility about words and syllables, with such a loss of the common powers of reasoning, in one who has not been ill educated? It is hard to predict from what absurdities in Biblical criticism a person would shrink, who has so perverted his faculties as to expound the Christian world to mean worldly Christians. To such a mind, the knowledge of the mere languages, Greek and Hebrew, is an *ignis fatuus*, if indeed* this is a specimen of other criticisms. But who need doubt that their critical principles

* It may seem to be a *morecean* much valued in their school; for in turning the pages of the Christian Witness we have met the same idea more than once. Thus, vol. i. p. 350, Note, where somebody is rebuked for wishing universities to be *a preparation and introduction to the world*. We should refer to John xvii. 15, but text-quoting between us and the brethren is useless.

must be *other than common*, when this Brother reckons *Philology* among the parts of 'worldliness' to be avoided by Christians? We have not room to enlarge on this absurdity. But surely, all who know anything of antiquity, know that to appreciate the force and spirit of an ancient tongue, far more is needed than the bare letter which a dictionary can afford. What we intended to ascribe to the Brethren is this; a superstitious feeling concerning the dialect of the Scriptures, as though 'the words of the Holy Ghost,' were not also human words subject to the same laws as those of common men: hence they have a horror of all explanation depending on *figures of speech*,* however convincing may be the proof at hand, that this is the real interpretation; and when they compare Scripture with Scripture to find the force of words, it is less because the dialect happens to be the same in the books compared, than to ascertain how 'the Holy† Ghost' employs terms. Nay, they appear to dread the study of common Greek, as though it would mislead them as to the SS. We believe this to be a most hurtful error, tending to promote superstition with some, infidelity with others; and destroying in numberless cases the true sense of the sacred volume.

This Brother complains that we do not rest our opposition to them on texts of Scripture. His complaint touches the heart of the subject, and *assumes* that which we are strenuously denying; viz. that all knowledge available or useful to a Christian is contained in the Scripture. What a confusion of mind it implies, to imagine that *the laws of interpretation* can be dictated by the Scripture, when every text quoted on the subject, needs to be itself interpreted before it can be used! Our main controversy with these Brethren is concerning laws of interpretation, laws of argument and evidence; we contend that they have heated imaginations, and are deficient in sound sense. We understand this Brother's texts very differently from him, and our controversy can never be thus settled. The publication of the letter of Scripture is a vast blessing, because so much holy and most important truth is on the surface; about which there is little question among Christians. But three centuries in this country have fully demonstrated the falsehood of the old maxim, *Bonus textuarius bonus theologus*. A MIND to interpret the texts is

* The Brother does not object to our statement, that they hold that our Lord's maxims must not be modified by considering their Hebrew idiom. We might as well say, that English is to be interpreted 'by the laws of grammar, without reference to the English idiom.'

† The Englishman's Greek Concordance, favourably noticed in our November Number, is executed by the Brethren. We did not choose there to stir the question, but barely glanced at it.

first essential, and no text-quoting will separate man from his intellect, or the spiritual from the natural understanding. That there may be life in the letter, we need not only to have our religious feelings quickened, but also our mental faculties soundly developed. Yet these Brethren virtually teach, that the weaker a man's perceptive and argumentative powers, the more likely is he to attain divine truth.

Since this Brother does not object to our statement that they regard history as a 'worldly' study, we presume that he includes it in the *et cætera*. Yet he (as they) has no objection to try his hand at historical argument, in the following words, p. 503, note: 'IT IS NOTORIOUS that mere literature has never done anything 'but mischief in the church, removing men from the simplicity 'that is in Christ. *As literature advanced and prevailed, the 'truth became darkened, diluted, and mixed with pernicious 'errors, until at length it was well nigh extinguished. To the 'learned we may trace almost every heresy and false doctrine which 'has at any time plagued or desolated the church; and if we desire 'to see infidelity raging under the Christian name, we must turn 'our eyes to the neologians of Germany, who are admittedly in 'philology, mere criticism and literature, facile principes. And 'yet* the religionists, especially the dissenters, of these countries, 'have failed to take warning from this.'* 'Mere' literature, is doubtless a double-edged weapon, and so is 'mere' criticism: each may be mere counterfeits. But we do not hesitate to assert, that the facts of history inculcate the very opposite lesson to that which this extract is designed to convey. So far from it being true that the departure of the early church from the faith is chargeable on 'literature,' in any sense which that word now bears, it may be difficult to suggest any accessible human means which would have more efficiently resisted that sad declension, than the general study of Cicero, Xenophon, Tacitus, and other sober classical authors, by Christians of the second and third century. The disease of the church was fanaticism, credulity, and superstition; an obscuration of the primary notions of morals, and a loss of common sense. *The Scriptures were in the hands of all, but none could use them aright.* It is most certain, that the decline of literature and sound judgment in the age at large, went hand in hand with the decline of true religion in the church. Farther, the spread of Latin (*heathen*) literature in Europe, was the dawn of religious improvement in the middle ages; while the introduction of Greek (*heathen*) literature was the herald of the Reformation. Since then, if we ask why it is

* It is believed that the Brother is by no means well-informed, nor is an adequate judge, concerning the progress of the German mind: but it is too great and arduous a subject here to touch.

that *we* discern many truths more clearly than our fathers; why we do not believe their demonology, nor their astrology; why we burn neither witches nor heretics; why we do not abuse the Old Testament to the same extent, and use it to justify crusades; why, in short, we are beyond them in the discernment of any point which can be boldly pronounced to be The Truth; the only answer is, because *the mind of the age* is somewhat more cultivated. It is not by a larger outpouring of the Spirit; for the unspiritual partake in this light. Had not astronomy and other physical science dispelled the superstitions but recently general, these very Brethren might be now deciding causes of witchcraft by texts from Moses, or fighting battles with demons like Luther. Errors pardonable in the uneducated, are by no means so in *them*; and least of all, while the FACT remains, that those among them who by superior capacity and cultivation would in any worldly society take the lead, are also The *Gifted* and Ruling men in their church.

So widely do we differ from this Brother's axiom (for as such it must be regarded), that philology, rhetoric, literature, et cætera, are *worldly* things in his sense, that we believe all honest exercise of the mind to be a truly religious matter. As the firing at a target forms an expert archer or musketeer; so the seeking after truth and nothing but the truth, in common every day topics, imparts to it a *habit*, which it retains in spiritual inquiries. Nay, we believe that one who should attempt to confine his mind to the latter subject, would inevitably contract most vicious habits of arguing and investigating. For we have not the same ability to verify and correct the processes of the intellect, when veneration or fear press too heavily on the reasoning faculty.—‘But the Brethren are so spiritual and so devoted, they surely would not be allowed to go wrong;’ says each concerning the rest. We reply, the most *devoted* men that ever lived, yes, and the most unworldly (if this is spirituality) have been among the Roman Catholics, and those, very superstitious ones. Man cannot with impunity transgress the conditions of being within which God has placed him; and he who tries to be holy *out* of the world, instead of holy *in* the world, must soon fall into gross and mischievous errors, from which a little of the world's ordinary sense might have saved him. Moreover, no declamations against Rhetoric secure men from using the lowest rhetorical tricks; no neglect of Ethics or Logic will serve to improve their insight into human duty, or their powers of investigation.

We must finally declare, that our own convictions have been much strengthened by the study of this Brother's reply, as to the substantial justice of all our complaints against them. What indeed but the most exclusive principles and peremptory denunciations, can one expect from the advocates of ignorance?

Whenever he touches a point of difference, he displays this dogmatic temper. Thus (p. 507): 'Neologically to explain the law of leprosy as a regulation of quarantine, or that of the avenger of blood as an adopted Arab custom, does surely argue a mind *very*, if not *utterly*, dark as to things spiritual.' It is not our purpose to advocate any particular interpretation; but we must protest against the Brother's supremacy over our faith. There is absolutely nothing in either Old or New Testament to prohibit what he is pleased to term the 'Neological' view; and whether it be true or not, can only be determined by that 'general literature' which he reprobates. If the phenomena of the oriental leprosy agree pretty nearly with the Mosaic; especially *if* there be two sorts, infectious and non-infectious (that is, unclean and clean); it would be irrational to reject the elucidation. The other question is equally connected with the laws of ancient nations concerning the exile of an accidental homicide.

As this brother is perplexed to know what we ever hoped for from them, and why we are disappointed, we will tell him. We admire enthusiasm, as we do the sportive bounds of a child, or the vehemence of youth. It is a noble power, stirring the heart deeply, the spring of every reformation; generally self-denying, self-devoting, connected with the highest principles of humanity. But its effervescence too soon sours into fanaticism. When it becomes intolerant—when, claiming private judgment for itself, it denies the same to others—when it is exclusive and dogmatic—when it proscribes all literature except its own productions—when it forbids the cultivation and strengthening of the intellect—when it shuts out intercourse with other minds, equal to its own in power, but differing in sentiment—our hopes of good from it fall indeed very low. Nay, another fear remains, that the distortion of understanding which it occasions may degenerate into pious frauds and cunning expediency, as happened with the ancient church. What are we to think of this principle (not repudiated by the Brother), that 'it is a presumption to criticise the historical evidence for the canon of Scripture?' what, but that they adopt an irrational assumption, barely because they must else renounce their tenet of the uselessness of literature and mental cultivation.

We complained of their 'scornful, supercilious tone;' this Brother now recriminates on us, as equalling their scorn. We have hereby been led closely to interrogate our conscience, and obtain the following answer. It is possible that we have been led beyond bounds in our expressions; to pretend otherwise would be to advocate our infallibility or perfection. But most sincerely do we feel, that not one of the Brethren's sentiments that can be separated from intolerance would be treated by us with disrespect (however ill-grounded we might think them), if they

were held with ordinary modesty. But to meet with this intolerance, this hatred of liberty, this virtual teaching that ignorance is the mother of devotion, from men who have themselves seceded and claimed the rights of conscience, and whose influence, whatever it is, depends on their education and their intellectual energy,—this certainly so fills us with pity and indignation, that the mixture is probably very similar to scorn. But whatever of this sort has been said, is directed not against the mass of their followers (whom it is not possible to know in detail), but against those who suppose that by the sacrifice of their estates or worldly prospects, they purchase a right to lord it over the faith of their fellow Christians. The only excuse which we know for them is a poor one: that they are so shut up among themselves, and hear their own thoughts so re-echoed, that they cease to be aware how magisterial is the place they have taken.

Art. VII. *Lectures on Preaching.* By EBENEZER PORTER, President of the Theological Seminary, Andover. London: Ward and Co.

THE abundance of books in any particular department of study is by no means a proof that the subject has attained its ultimate perfection. So far, indeed, from this being an index of such result, it may be and is more often the evidence of defect. The subject is not set at rest, it is more properly overlaid; and the repetition of instruction proves that the master-mind has not yet appeared: when such a mind once speaks all weaker efforts are useless. Neither have the ages which produced the most celebrated books on the theory of any art been renowned for the most finished specimens of its practice. Criticism did not become a study till long after the time when Homer had written; Quintillian composed his *Institutes* at a period when eloquence had forsaken the Roman senate; and it was amidst the din of the polemical strife of the Commonwealth, that Stillingfleet and Burroughs wrote their *Irenica*, and 'Peace Offerings' were placed on the national altar in such astonishing plenty. On similar principles we are perhaps warranted in believing that the very great number of elementary books on the eloquence of the pulpit which characterizes the age, is a correlative, if, indeed, it be not an index of the feeble and attenuated character of preaching prevailing amongst us: the ancient *athletæ* carried with them no rolls of strengthening plaster to the arena.

A mere catalogue of treatises of this nature would, we are per-

suaded, astonish our readers, or at least that portion of them who are not accustomed to the melancholy observation, that in the prosecution of human affairs we are often at a loss to discover which of two facts is the most remarkable, the profusion of instrumentality, or the insignificance of result. In our own little collection besides the treatises of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintillian on the nature of oratory, we have a magnitude and variety of prædicatorial apparatus sufficient to give success to the labours of all the preachers in the world, if the best tempered weapons and the best instruction in the adroit use of them were the alone conditions of victory; but as we have painfully experienced in our own case, the silver handle and the embroidered scabbard of the sword give no pledge of the sharpness of the point; and the thrust of a most unpolished weapon, directed in defiance of all the rules of the masters of the noble art, shall often be successful when artificial exactness has utterly failed to teach.

Among the treatises on the art of preaching which were in the hands of our ancestors, there were three or four small works in Latin, which acquired a great and deserved reputation, and to which we the more willingly refer as they are little known to modern students, and their perusal might be beneficial in forming the habits of our junior brethren. The duodecimo of Gausenus, entitled 'De ratione studii theologici,' the treatise of Crocius under the same title, the *Manuductio* of Frankius, and the work 'De pastore evangelico' of our countryman Bowles, are admirable preparatories to the more regular and critical study of theology. Our old divinity is rich in this department. That racy though antiquated puritan divine, Richard Bernard of Batcombe, whose 'Isle of Man' is the genuine ancestor of Bunyan's 'Holy War,' has left a tract on the pastoral office entitled 'The Faithful Shepherd,' 1621, which is by no means unworthy of perusal. Prince, the historian of the worthies of Devon, Glanvil, of witch-believing memory, and the all-learned Wotton, have each written on this subject, and each has instamped on his book the characteristic features which even the smallest productions of original minds ever bear. Bishop Wilkins's treatise is too well known to need any mention, and the *Gildas Salvianas* of Baxter soars too far above the reach of criticism in the ardour of its unaffected piety to need any recommendation. The eccentric though truly respectable '*Manuductio ad Ministerium*' of Cotton Mather, is chiefly known to the British public by a very injudicious abridgment which has contrived to omit all the racy originality of the original, and has effectually tamed the somewhat uncouth gambols of the high mettled courser of Massachusetts into the formal amble of a young gentleman's poney docked of his tail and mane to bring him into the prevailing fashion. Fenelon's essay has

long been appreciated, and Campbell, great in his 'Philosophy of Rhetoric,' greater still in his work on the Gospels, and greatest of all on 'Miracles,' is generally approved in his 'Pulpit Eloquence' by all who make this subject a part of their study. Of Claude we say nothing but that his English translator has so effectually buried his author under a farrago of often irrelevant though always interesting notes, that whatever may be the design of the original work, the English version is as far as possible from answering the design of instructing young ministers in the composition of a sermon. Whatever may be the merits of the more recent of these publications—and that they have merit we are abundantly willing to admit—there is one error pervading all of them, an error we believe of the most fatal consequence, and one which must be opposed and successfully exposed if we ever expect to see the preaching of the gospel of Christ possess that high character of instrumentality for which it was intended in the designs of its great Author; and that error is the general and in many cases the entire omission of serious exhortation to young ministers on the indispensable necessity of acquiring the genuine meaning of that book which they profess to explain. We are deeply and painfully convinced that ignorance of the mind of God in the Scriptures, is the sin of a great majority of Christians; that our congregations are distressingly uninformed of the meaning of that language which God has addressed to their understandings, and that there are popular and eloquent discourses spoken in our places of worship on the Sabbath day, and which receive the plaudits of admiring crowds, which contain no attempt to explain the portion of truth on which they are professedly grounded, and which, whilst they abound in meretricious eloquence and in all the figures of artificial oratory, leave the hearers deplorably deficient in clear and enlightened views of that which is the alone work for which the ministry was originally appointed, the testimony of truth. We speak it in sorrow, and with a distinct conviction how disagreeable such an avowal must be to many whom we love—but we give it as our solemn and heartfelt conviction: *the word of God is but rarely explained in the pulpit, and hence it is but little understood by our people.* We have listened to much admired pieces of hortatory eloquence in the pulpits of the metropolis, to addresses in which the most jejune views of the word of God have been brought forth, and because they were brought forth in a cloud of sesquipedalian words and lofty imagery, the penury, or occasionally even the distortion of sense in the exegesis has been forgotten amidst the admiration which has been lavished on the medium of its conveyance.

In addition to the works to which we have already alluded, we have now another publication on this subject by Dr. Porter, the President of the Theological Seminary at Andover, in the United

States. Like the generality of the theological publications of our transatlantic brethren, the work is respectable. To originality it makes no pretension, but it is written with good sense and moderation, and is deeply imbued with the spirit of piety. Like all the publications, however, which have appeared in that country, it manifests a most deplorable deficiency in the knowledge of the best English books, and especially in the department of sermons. In the author's list of English sermons the names of Thomas Jackson, Donne, Farrington, Bebington, Brownrig, Sherlock, Samuel Clarke, Horbery, Sanderson, and Stillingfleet, do not once occur. We should have thought that such omissions were beyond even the capacity of Anglo-American ignorance of English classics. Certainly it is not our intention to recommend either of these great men as finished sermonizers, but we are at a loss to understand how a preacher can be presumed to be prepared for regular pulpit exercise in the English language, without being made acquainted with the great authors to whom we have alluded; who together with Jewel, Chillingworth, Rainolds, Willet, Whittaker, Hooker, Carleton, Hakewill, and other men of the same time and the same spirit, will continue to be the glory of the English pulpit in all that regards depth and solidity of judgment and masculine energy of thought, when many of the men mentioned by Dr. Porter are forgotten. Our brethren are, however, becoming better acquainted with our older and truly classical writers, and ere long, we are convinced, those writers will occupy the place in the minds of the reading classes of the United States which their intrinsic merits deserve. A shade of melancholy, however, passes over our minds as we observe that these tests of our country's intellectual power are becoming daily more difficult to be obtained: we have reprints of every thing ludicrous and uncouth which antiquity in its strangest freaks has bequeathed us, but the theological folios which originally procured from the tongue even of foreigners the testimony so glorious to England, *Clerus Anglicus stupor mundi*, are suffered from year to year to become still more scarce, till at length, as some of us have painfully realized within a few days, there are many of them which are not on any terms to be procured

Art. VIII. *The Claims of Japan and Malaysia, Exhibited in Notes of Voyages made in 1837, from Canton, in the Ship Morrison and Brig Himmaleh.* 2 vols. New York. 1839. London: Wiley and Putnam.

AMONG the remarkable features of the age, perhaps there are few more astonishing, certainly there is none so important in its connexion with the dissemination of those principles which are to bless the whole family of mankind, as the attitude in which the United States of America are beginning to stand towards the older sections of the world, and especially towards the east. It is now but little more than two centuries since the small band of English confessors, destined in the mysterious counsels of Providence to become the fathers of a new, and preserved, perhaps, hereafter to be the teachers and reformers of the old world, landed on the rock of Plymouth. Flying from that persecuting rage which attempted to destroy in their own country the spirit of free inquiry, and to substitute a blind vassalage to the pompous rituals of a Romanizing hierarchy for the spiritual and pure worship of the heart, they sought the shores of America to secure that noblest of all blessings under the wide canopy of heaven,—the rights of conscience. They issued forth into the wilderness possessed of little else but that hardy frame of body and mind which their native land had given them;—the head that could plan, the heart that could determine, and the arm that could execute a bold design: the healthy throb of English liberty beat high within their breast, and gave a determination to their resolves which none but freemen can ever feel, and these materials for noble bearing were directed and controlled by one principle—the best, the noblest, and the most elevating which man in this lower world can enjoy, the knowledge and the love of the truth. They carried with them the Bible—that sacred book was the ark which sanctified and defended their camp; to the worship enjoined in its pages were their earliest cares devoted; and from the principles it contained were derived the polity, the laws, the whole spirit of that government which they chose to be the guardian of their persons, their property, and their rights. What are the results that have followed that voyage? Let Europe behold the present state of the Anglo-American republic. To the philanthropist, the politician, the Christian, she presents a spectacle truly interesting, a problem before untried in the history of nations. She has demonstrated beyond the possibility of contradiction, that a free people will secure to themselves, by the unfettered exercise of their own judgment, that form of government which is best adapted to their wants, and that at the least possible expenditure to the public purse; and that voluntary efforts are the most efficient means of sup-

plying a nation with religious instruction, and of carrying out and extending the principles of the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah. In the estimate to which we are now directing the attention of our readers, we have no wish to amuse by descanting on the gigantic proportions of the transatlantic colossus: neither the magnitude of the territory, the rapidly increasing ratio of population, the extent of commercial enterprise, the magic growth of the western cities of this vast empire,—neither any nor all of these have engaged for her our sympathies. The consideration of her moral and religious phenomena, and of the influence she is now exerting, and is enabled by Divine Providence to exert in a still more ample and beneficial degree in meliorating the spiritual condition of the human family, by giving to them the blessings of knowledge and civilization, thus realizing the designs of an ever merciful Providence in bringing again a fallen and degraded world to God and to holiness, is the alone ground of our admiration. Whether national welfare be best secured by the gorgeous trappings of a monarchy, or by the Doric plainness of republican simplicity, is a problem, towards the solution of which we shall offer no attempt; whether the advantages of social intercommunion are rendered more efficient by the suavity of aristocratic mannerism or by the inartificial rusticity of plebean familiarity; whether the sum of human happiness be greater in the land whose citizens enjoy a sober uniformity of possession equally remote from poverty and from excessive wealth, or in that where the extremes of both are met with in immediate contiguity, are beside the range of our present design; but the anticipated instrumentality of this great republic in evangelizing the nations, in pouring out the flood of light which is to scatter the thick darkness now covering the world in its three great divisions of Heathen, Mahometan, and Anti-christian delusions, is to us, and we trust will be to all, a subject of deep and thrilling interest. It is evident to all the true disciples of our blessed Master, that the old world has hitherto failed in the design of evangelizing the nations, if, indeed, that can be called a failure which has never been seriously enterprised: she has either faithlessly betrayed the cause, or proved herself utterly inadequate to the task. The only country which is now using any legitimate effort in its furtherance is itself deplorably and utterly destitute, as to the vast majority of its inhabitants, of that very evangelization which it is the will and the command of the Founder of our religion should pervade every land and regulate every conscience: its millions of baptized heathens in the savage ignorance of their mind, and the ferocious sensuality of their moral character, their drunkenness, their oaths, their pollution, and their depredations on property, testifying too plainly to the inadequacy of the existing system to Christianize its own advocates; and speaking in terms not to be

misunderstood, of the utter hopelessness that such a system will ever even attempt the conversion of the world. Praiseworthy exertions have been made, and with much success, by different Christian sects of this country, who have adopted a system of religious operation more in accordance with the genius of religion itself, and the recorded proceedings of its Founder, and even by a section of the dominant party, who in acting in their missionary exertions on the principles of others, have practically acknowledged the inadequacy of their own; but the system which the nation has adopted, has utterly failed even to make its own supporters Christians. Its legislators have, indeed, made Christianity the law of the land, but as to its being the law of obedience to the people,—the only way in which it can possibly accomplish the great ends for which it is designed,—such an object is now as far from being effected as in the days of its primitive conveyance to these shores. In this highly privileged kingdom a professedly reformed system of our common faith has been established and endowed, at a higher expense to the public than perhaps any other existing form of religion. For upwards of two hundred and fifty years it has tried by all possible means, by the banishment, the civil disqualification, and occasionally by the putting to death those of a different opinion, to keep its machinery in exclusive operation, and by pecuniary mulcts to make even its opponents contribute towards the sluggish motion of the unwieldy engine: and now let the results of this so lauded instrumentality be seen in the fact, that the overwhelming mass of the community is fearfully ignorant of the spiritual and regenerating influence of the great truths of Christianity, that even as regards a rational comprehension of the system of biblical knowledge no inconsiderable number are perfectly and fatally uninformed, and that the debauchery of the operatives of our cities and manufacturing towns, and the sensuality, ignorance, and superstition of our peasantry are such as to make them ripe for sedition, incendiarism, and open infidelity, from which latter state they are preserved by the fearful alternative, that they never exercise their thoughts on any subject higher than the mere gratification of appetite: safe only from the easy seduction of socialism, or the daring wickedness of the system of Thomas Paine, by the one defence of a total destitution of any mental effort.

When, in order to form a just opinion of the relative advantages of both systems, we turn our eyes to the American continent, and observe the operation of the voluntary system in the northern and middle states, especially where alone it has been tried for a sufficient time to enable us to form a correct judgment; when we listen to the testimony of unprejudiced, and to the still more important testimony of prejudiced travellers, acknowledging that there is scarcely an uneducated adult in these provinces, asserting the de-

cent propriety of the moral conduct of the great body of the people; when we see these statements corroborated by statistical documents of the criminal and penal annals of those states; when we hear of the prevalence of vital and scriptural Christianity in most districts, and observe the influence which it exercises on the national institutions, the habits of society, and, in some instances, on the public and political dealings of this republic with other nations, and especially of late with heathen nations, we look at her with a kind of reverence, and feel an honest pride at reflecting that these are the genuine effects of the principles we advocate. To New England, we repeat, to the valleys irrigated by the Connecticut river, would we refer the philosophical and philanthropic inquirer into the relative efficiency of different forms of religion, on the formation of the human character; there let him learn that religion in its purity, in its moralizing efficiency on the human heart, in all that it imparts of sanctity in this world, and of preparation for another, is best secured and established when it is left to the spontaneous and hearty affection of those who feel its value. Let the inquirer observe facts, and trace them to their principles. Let him observe that the Christian religion has hitherto, with very few exceptions, been supported in America on the same system in which it was originally left by its divine Master and his inspired apostles, and on which it depended for the first three hundred years of its existence, when its growth was stopped and its vigor manacled by the cumbrous armour of a state alliance. Let him institute a comparison between its state in the two different countries which we have purposely chosen to contrast together, as being confessedly the portions of the world where Christianity is most known, and whence its blessings are to be poured forth in the expected regeneration of the world. Let him observe the progress of education in the American republic, the paucity of crime, the tone of moral feeling pervading her community; let him remember that societies formed on the principle of a total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, are now almost general through the length and breadth of the land, that there are several states wherein, except for medicinal purposes, these provocatives cannot easily be procured even in houses of public refreshment, and that this example is likely to be followed throughout the Union; and, finally, that according to the statement of a respectable minister of that country lately on a visit of brotherly affection to the Dissenting churches of England, were not the number of dissolute foreigners an obstacle to the design, there is a great probability that alcoholic mixtures would be effectually banished from the whole republic, as they are already from a great portion of that class of its subjects who were once supposed to need them most, the sailors and operatives. These are facts that speak too plainly of the moral state of America to be silenced

by the suspicions of Tory prejudice, or the insinuations of hierarchical intolerance. We know well, that the force of this evidence is attempted to be avoided by the statement of a great destitution of ministerial instruction in many sections of this great country, and that this statement is considered by uncandid men as supplying an argument against the validity of the voluntary principle. If we could hope to bind down our opponents to follow the results of a full examination of this point, we should be happy to rest the weight of the argument on this very fact. Could we expect candor to have any room in the mind of the person who puts forth this statement, we should ask him, before he adventure on any numerical experiment, to make allowance first for the fact, that the several states of that great republic were originally colonized by very different races, and by companies of the same nation of very different and opposite views in politics and in religion, and that sufficient time has not yet elapsed for the several states to combine in the formation of one national character, but that each province yet preserves, in a great degree, the feelings, the prejudices, and the intellectual features of the country and the sect from whence their ancestors sprung. The high aristocratic Episcopalian of Somerset and Devon is still to be found in Virginia and Carolina, the Quaker in Pennsylvania, the Baptist in Rhode Island, the Independent of Lincolnshire, and Suffolk, and Essex, in Connecticut and Massachussets. In the provinces of New England, peopled originally by the Presbyterians, and Independents, and Baptists, there is a supply of ministerial agency fully adequate to the population, and certainly equal in relative proportion to the number of the same class in England, as appears by undoubted statistical documents. And be it remembered, that these states are the Goshen of America, and that even English Tory prejudice has been constrained to acknowledge, in a late tour through Connecticut, that in the villages of that province the principles of morality and religion are better practised than perhaps in any other part of the world. The states of Virginia and the Carolinas were colonized by Episcopal aristocrats and Tories, and Maryland very principally by the English Roman Catholics. It can not surprise any one who reflects on the unvarying character of Toryism in every age, and in every clime, to find that dissoluteness of manners yet characterizes this section of the republic, and that it should walk hand in hand in these states with the support of slavery. And if the observer will further remember, that this part of the United States is distinguished also by a manifest inferiority in the numerical proportion of ministers to the more favored regions of the north, he will be assisted, perhaps, in accounting for the defect by the remembrance, that the ancestors of the present planters being principally Episcopalians of the English Church, had been educated in the habit of looking to the government for the supply of their reli-

gious wants. If the admirers of the coercive system will point out these provinces of America as affording an instance of what they call the failure of the voluntary principle, let them remember that Virginia and Carolina were the only provinces of America where the English Episcopacy was ever established by law; that the slave provinces of the south were precisely the very sections of the country which were first colonized by the zealous defenders of Toryism and Episcopacy; that these principles yet prevail in these states more than in any other section of the Union, and that what has been done there for religion has been principally effected by a healthy importation of more enlightened and more liberal measures and men from the northern states. The southern and Tory states of America are as remarkable for a low state of education and morals, as the children of the Puritans are for the contrary. The western and trans-Alleghany sections of this republic can scarcely be said to be yet settled; but a few years ago they were either an impervious forest where the axe of civilization had never resounded, or waste prairies, the range of the wild bison, or of the wilder Indian. To expect a supply of ministers in these districts adequate to the geographical dimensions of the land, or even to the numbers of its widely scattered inhabitants, is what no candid, no fair inquirer into the relative capabilities of the different systems could pretend to justify, especially when he remembers that a considerable portion of these people are dissolute natives of Britain, unaccustomed from educational habits to any feeling of concern about their destitution of religious instruction; whilst others, especially in Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana, are Irish papists, who have felt too acutely the oppression of a national clergy distinct in religion and manners from the inhabitants, and forced upon them, and supported by the aid of Protestant bayonets, to entertain any great affection to Protestantism. Such an inquirer will also remember, that the supposed deficiency in the proportion of ministerial agency which is presumed to characterize the western states, is built on the inaccurate, and, indeed, now obsolete statistical report of Dr. Dwight, who, though an excellent man, was, let it be remembered, a bigoted Congregationalist; for, alas, bigotry is not confined to England, nor to Episcopacy; and as a proof of his bigotry, in the various religious statistics he has inserted in his otherwise excellent book of travels, he takes no account of any ministers but those who were regularly educated in the theological colleges, and recognized by the ceremony of ordination, omitting altogether that class so common in the western provinces especially, who are in the constant habit of imparting religious instruction without the previous reception of ordination, in consequence either of some scruple at the rite, or their distance from brethren of their own faith and order. This class is very numerous amongst the different sections

of Methodists, the various schools of the Baptists, and the minor sections of Christian modification which the scrupulous or erroneous conscience has originated with such abundance in that country. To add to this consideration, since the publication of Dr. Dwight's work, great changes have taken place in the religious relation of that part of America, a circumstance that should have a very obvious influence on the statements of our countrymen respecting the United States. No where in the whole world does the face of nature and of society change so rapidly, and institutions move onwards to their acme with such velocity : the circumstances of mankind there forbid any thing to be stationary, and more is done within ten years than can be performed here in a century. Since that statement was first put forth, great exertions have been made by the Presbyterian and Congregational churches in the formation and working of Home Missionary societies, and these societies have been for many years in active operation in the very districts where the destitution was once felt and complained of; and ministers of many denominations, but principally of the two former, and the Baptist and Methodist connexion, are now in addition to the original number, either settled over separate churches, or are evangelizing the most distant parts in orderly and periodic succession. In fact, relying on the testimony of gentlemen from America, we dare assert that the proportion of ministers to the whole population is, even in the distant provinces, nearly, if not quite equal to the average proportion of resident and preaching ministers in England; and that compared with the secluded parts of the highlands, and especially with the western islands of Scotland, the superiority will be found greatly in favour of the United States.

The reflections which we have offered above to the consideration of our readers, arose from a glance at the work whose title stands at the head of this article, connected as these volumes are with many of a similar character which have lately proceeded from the press, as records of the labours of the American churches. When we think of the vast efforts which the Christians of that land are making for the evangelization of the heathen, and consider the ability, the practical good sense, the self-denial, and the scriptural piety exemplified in the publications of her missionaries, we have no doubt—whatever their enemies may say—as to the real state of religion in the churches which sent them forth; and we congratulate ourselves on this additional proof of the efficacy of the principles we have already seen triumphant in its home operations. The investigations preparatory to missionary excursions which are recorded in the volumes named at the head of this article, were undertaken by the American missionaries and merchants residing in the year 1837, at China. The first volume gives an account of the voyage of the ship *Morrison*, from Macao to Japan. This ship was commanded by Captain Ingersoll, and carried

Doctor Parker, Mr. Gutzlaff, the well known missionary, and Messrs. Williams and King, as passengers; and it was hoped that its approach to the interdicted ports of Japan would be facilitated by the undoubted benevolence of at least one object of this voyage, the intended restoration to their native land of three parties of Japanese seamen, who had been shipwrecked on the different shores of western America, Hainan, and Luzonia in the eastern Archipelago, and by the character of the vessel, which was deprived of all her warlike implements for the sake of allaying suspicion as to her designs. The object of the second volume is to give the details of the voyage of the brig *Himmaleh* from Macao to Singapoor, and successively to Celebes, Ternate, Borneo, and other isles of the Indian Sea. This vessel was commanded by Captain Fraser, and had on board Mr. Stevens, an American missionary, and on his decease, at Singapoor, Mr. Dickinson, a gentleman of the same official character, and Mr. Lay, an English naturalist, and an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Mr. Lay is the author of the second volume, as Mr. King is of the first, and two volumes of a more interesting character, interesting in the most exalted sense, as having for their object the record of a truly benevolent and Christian design, were never presented to the public. In the light of documents on the moral state of the countries they respectively regard, they are valuable to the philanthropist; to the student of nature they offer some original, and in truth, some philosophical observations, which we doubt not will be of considerable value in the theories of atmospheric phenomena, and other kindred sciences; but it is in their religious aspect we especially regard them as at once affording a valuable testimony to the disinterestedness and benevolence of the Christians of America, and as supplying a long desired directory in the prosecution of future designs for the civilization and evangelization of the eastern world, at that glorious and long expected time when the energies of Europe and the other Christianized sections of the earth, shall be extensively and fully called forth to the high and noble work of raising their degraded and idolatrous fellow men to the knowledge, and worship, and obedience of God.

Japan has been long known to Europe as being, conjointly with China, the country most impervious to the civilization and science of Europe; her ports have been for the period of a century obstinately shut to all intercourse with this portion of the world, excepting in a very limited degree with Holland; and this privilege appears to have been granted to the Dutch as a reward for their not very honourable conduct towards the Portuguese and Spaniards in the quarrels between those nations and the Japanese. This jealousy of foreigners has been exercised to such a degree of intolerance, that European vessels are not permitted to enter her

ports, and in those instances where her own countrymen have been shipwrecked on distant shores, their return to their native land has been virtually forbidden, as all attempts to land them from European ships in Japan have been prevented by force. We have already observed, that this benevolent object was again undertaken in the present instance, and to prevent the possibility of any misconstruction of the designs of the agent of this enterprise, the vessel undertook her voyage deprived of all her military apparatus. It was hoped that whilst this first purpose was answered, and the shipwrecked Japanese were restored to their country and to their families, a regular mode of intercourse might be established between Japan and America, and that opportunities might be afforded of conveying the blessings of pure Christianity to its many millions of idolatrous inhabitants. Our readers are aware that a peculiarly corrupt form of that religion did once exist, and, indeed, so far as numbers and influence are concerned, may be said at one time to have flourished in Japan; but the ambitious designs of the Popish priesthood being discovered to the ruling powers, the European missionaries were universally banished, and the native converts, after a series of sanguinary persecutions, were at length effectually and completely eradicated. In truth, the secular designs which the Japanese government detected as lying hidden under the mask of proselytism in the Roman priesthood, first directed the storms of persecution against the professors of Christianity, and have ever since been the cause of the extraordinary policy which has forbidden all intercourse with the professors of that faith. The vessel was furnished with printed documents in the Japanese language, expressive of her exclusively pacific character, the benevolent object she contemplated, and the wish of America to establish an intercourse which might be favourable to both countries; it was hoped that the known fact of that country having no form of religion connected with her state polity, would be a sufficient guarantee that such designs as had been in former ages charged on Portugal and Spain, would not be suspected in the present instance; and it was felt as a favourable omen of the enterprise, that if an opportunity should be granted by this or succeeding attempts of introducing a purer form of Christianity into this country, one objection to its reception would at least be obviated, in its entire independence on national and secular power. If Christianity were thus again to visit the shores of Japan, it would go in its own character and for its own sake, and not as the means of securing national aggrandisement, and of advancing worldly power and ambition.

We regret to say, that as far as concerns the primary and ostensible object of this enterprise, the design failed: the vessel was not permitted to approach the shores, and the Japanese authorities did all that was possible to prevent any connexion between the

inhabitants and the crew; they even carried their bigoted and short-sighted policy to such an unjustifiable height as to open a fire from batteries constructed for the purpose, on the unoffending vessel, though well acquainted, from printed documents in their own language, and circulated abundantly amongst their countrymen, with the pacific character of the voyage, and the utter impossibility of carrying on any belligerent design, in consequence of the absence of the usual warlike armament; nay, farther, though the intention of the American captain of restoring the shipwrecked Japanese to their families and country was industriously circulated, and the humanity of that design very generally, at least among the poorer inhabitants, appreciated. But our readers will acknowledge, with us, that one object of the visit was obtained: it is worth the difficulties of the voyage to know that a large portion of mankind yet lies in this state of inhuman and savage hostility. We should scarcely have believed without this painful experience, that any section of the family of mankind, still less that a section not of barbarians, but of men who have attained to no mean proficiency in the arts, nay, even in some of the sciences of civilized life, and who in their own estimation have reached to a height of refinement from which they may regard the nations of Europe as barbarians, could thus outrage the rights of humanity. Here we have a stronger evidence than perhaps has yet been presented to the eye of philanthropy, of the need of missionary institutions. If there are yet even in our country individuals who doubt the propriety of efforts to Christianize, surely they will now concede, at least, the necessity of some well directed effort to humanize these children of the rising sun. That attempt shall be again made. The address to his Christian reader, with which Mr. King concludes his account of this frustrated benevolence, will not be read in vain by Christians in this and other lands.

‘If he will follow me, and the American people will follow me, through the inferences I would make from this experiment, and the plans I would ground on its apparent failure, results may be obtained equivalent to ample success. I said failure; but what are failures in any worthy cause? ‘the lesser waves repulsed and broken on the strand, while the great tide is rolling on, and gaining ground with every breaker.’ It is over a succession of repulsed and fallen instruments that grand plans, like the ocean tide, make their steady, irresistible advance.’

Though this voyage contributed but little to the great object of missions in any direct shape, yet the observations which occur in Mr. King’s narrative are well worthy of a missionary’s attention, and speak so favourably of the sobriety of his religious views, that we cannot refuse ourselves the pleasure of quoting one or

two. Speaking of one of those many causes that render sea voyages often tedious, Mr. King says—

‘No wonder, if at sea, after the failure of all and sundry signs and tokens of a coming breeze, a sovereign supporter of hope, ‘a special providence,’ should be called in to raise a wind. Let me not be understood to impugn the trust of the becalmed sailor; I would rather prompt him to admire the providence which has subjected the strongest influences he is called to encounter, to laws which he may usually ascertain, if he be intelligent, and will always conform to if he be humble and wise. Let him rely, then, on special interposition whenever the ‘*dignus vindice nodus*’ shall occur, but remember all the while, that benevolence is to be sought for in the rules of the Divine Government, rather than in exceptions to them; that it is no miracle for God to be kind.’—p. 161.

The volume commences with a well written introduction, in which Mr. King gives a concise history of the successive circumstances which have attended the intercourse of the several European nations with Japan, according to the order of their chronological connexion with the East. The Spanish and Portuguese narrative occupies, of course, the first place; and, as may naturally be supposed, occupies the greatest portion of this recital. To that succeeds the history of the Dutch factory; and, finally, we have a brief account of the English attempts to establish a connexion with that country, an account which might be considerably enlarged, and rendered far more interesting. A few pages on the Russian intercourse conclude this account.

An account of the voyage from Macao to the coast of Japan next succeeds, in which the author gives a narrative of his short stay at the interjacent isle of Loochoo. There are many observations on the currents and prevailing winds between China and Japan, which we doubt not will contribute to facilitate future missionary enterprises in this part of the ocean; but we confess the observation of our author on coming a second time within sight of Japan, conveys a sentiment we have so keenly felt on similar occasions, that we are tempted rather to select it for our readers than any of a more scientific character.

‘Uninteresting as this coast is, there was a kind of pleasure felt by all, again on the 23rd at the cry of ‘land.’ In fact, beautiful as the plateau is, whose centre the ship at sea always keeps, I observe that no one ever regrets when its perfect outline, on the broad base of the noble dome that covers it, is broken by any mean, little lump of ground. All share with the companions of Æneas, in the ‘*magno teluris amore*.’

After the author has described the various attempts made by

the ship's officers to open a friendly communication with the Japanese authorities, and lamented their unsuccessful result, he closes his volume in a strain of Christian reflection which gives us additional cause to regret that the enterprise did not succeed; for we cannot but think that had the men who were capable of penning such sentiments been permitted to hold any intercourse with the natives, some impression would have been made on their minds, and an opportunity secured for farther and more direct missionary exertions. Our author, in drawing his narrative to a close, has these admirable remarks—

‘To the friends of moral enterprise I would further say—You need not fear that your beneficence must needs run wild, because it takes up a rapid and distant march. On the contrary, like the ship at sea, it is manageable only while it moves on, cutting the sidelong current, and dashing opposition from its track; it fears the calm, and not the gale; its steerage is perfect so long as it has ‘head-way.’ To the friends of eastern Asia in the United States, I must once more say—let your answer to this imperfect appeal, if it have interested you, be promptly and actively expressed. The waters that gush the purest and most limpid from their fountains, by the laws of physical geography, become saline and bitter if they find no outlet; so, by the laws of mind, the best designs and sympathies, that never reach their object, are turned to worthlessness and impurity. Friends of eastern Asia, directors of the political, benevolent, religious influence of America, let it not be so with yours, with you.’

The second volume, which records the voyage of the brig *Himmaleh* in the Malayan Archipelago, is distinguished by an accuracy of description in several departments of natural history, and a philosophical style of reasoning, especially in the observations on atmospheric phenomena, which clearly attest that Mr. Lay is no inattentive or superficial observer of the circumstances in contact with which he is thrown in his travels. The islands of these seas are well known to this country as rich in many objects of natural curiosity as well as productive of articles of commerce, and our readers will easily believe that a man of Mr. Lay's character could not fail to enrich the account of his visit with many interesting observations. But neither the only, nor indeed, the most valuable sections of this book are the parts illustrative of the natural productions of these gems of the ocean: the moral statistics claim our especial regard, and will, we doubt not, prove of no little advantage in the salutary directions and useful hints which the author's good sense has enabled him to deduce from them, in prosecution of the great design to which his enterprise, as well as that of his companions, was devoted—the evangelization of this part of Asia. That part of his advice which struck us

as being singularly excellent, was the proposition of seeking to make our missionary efforts, in this part of the world especially, more generally acceptable to the natives by connecting them in every case with the benefit of European medical science, the undeniable superiority of which over the scanty empiricism of the native practitioners is acknowledged by the islanders universally, and will ultimately be productive of a very salutary influence in preparing them to listen to the truths of Christianity. It is certain, that by a judicious conduct of this kind on the part of the officers of the *de propaganda* society, the church of Rome obtained in former times a very ready welcome and a safe protection for her emissaries, under the shadow of which the principles of that church were at one time very prevalent in the countries adjacent to those of which we are now speaking.

On the whole, we must in justice say, that two more excellent volumes, both as it regards their religious tone and the reflections interspersed throughout, have seldom issued forth to the public in connexion with the missionary cause, while the general good sense, and accuracy of information, displayed cannot but exercise a very beneficial influence on the minds of those who professing themselves friendly to the dissemination of our holy religion generally, have often expressed a doubt as to the efficiency and even as to the suitability of the instrumentality generally employed in prosecution of that design. We are persuaded that no real philanthropist, no man who wishes the melioration of his species in relation either to their intellectual or moral nature, would scruple to employ and cherish such agents as the gentlemen who have given us the result of their benevolent voyages in these two volumes, or any persons who should act on their principles and according to the pattern here advocated: we at least can have no sympathy with the morbid apathy which regards such attempts with cool indifference. For our part, we reverence the authors of these and kindred volumes, as the true benefactors of our species, and should be glad if circumstances permitted, to share with them in their disinterested labours, and what we doubt not they will eventually enjoy, their glorious success.

Brief Notices.

Poems now first Collected. By Lord Leigh. 8vo. pp. 402. London: Moxon.

This is another of those volumes of which we have had a succession of late, from the hands of our aristocracy; and which if they do not startle us by their extraordinary outburst of power, give us a very amiable idea of the refined taste and elegant pleasures of their authors. We are glad to see them were it only for an evidence of this kind,—of the rational and delightful manner in which the wealth of this class of Englishmen enables them to pass their time—in travel, in study, and in poetical reflection. The former volumes of our author, then simple Chandos Leigh, have met with a favorable reception from the critics; the great distinguishing characteristics of this are excellent feeling, a spirit of liberal and unaffected piety, a contempt of the general tone and pursuits of fashionable life, and a sound and healthy expression of sentiments of liberty and the love of popular reform. In ‘the Letters to a Friend in Town,’ the reigning follies and dissipations are unsparingly lashed, and if we are ready to cry out for more vigor of arm, we are perfectly satisfied with the honesty and correctness of mind that dictate the satire. To those who prefer benevolent sentiments, a cordial love of nature, and of domestic enjoyments, rather than high-flown descriptions and stormy passions, this volume will, no doubt, be a welcome one.

Conversations for Children: on Land and Water. By Mrs. Marcet. London: Longman and Co.

This little volume consists of desultory conversations between a mother and several young children, ‘in which,’ says Mrs. Marcet, ‘I have endeavoured to mingle information with amusement, and to teach those of my young readers who may be learning geography, that there are other matters connected with land and water quite as interesting as the names and situation of the different parts of the earth.’ The style maintained is eminently suitable to the capacity of juvenile readers, while the information conveyed is adapted to awaken curiosity, and to lead on the young inquirer to the study of other and more complicated phenomena.

Seven Hundred Domestic Hints in every Branch of Family Management: combining Utility with Elegance, and Economy with the Enjoyment of Home. By a Lady. London: Tilt. 1839.

This little book will prove very serviceable to the young house-keeper by showing how easily economy and elegance may be combined in all domestic arrangements.

The Inquirer Directed to an Experimental and Practical View of the Atonement. By the Rev. Octavius Winslow. London: Shaw. 1839.

The author of this manual contemplates a mind anxiously inquiring 'What shall I do to be saved?' And anticipating the difficulties connected with the doctrine of the *atonement*, meets every inquiry with a lucid explanation and a salutary address to the heart. Its sound scriptural views, its pathetic appeals, its insinuating style, and its deep-toned piety, commend it to the candid attention of every awakened mind.

The Mabinogion. Part II. Containing Peredur the Son of Evrauc. By Lady Charlotte Guest. London: Longman and Co.; Llandovery: Rees.

This splendid work proceeds with a spirit equal to its promise. The present part contains the remainder of the Norman French version of *Le Chevalier au Lion*, and the story of *Peredur the Son of Evrauc*. *Peredur* is one of Arthur's knights, and his story is as wild as one of the *Arabian Nights*. It is just a delightfully romancing legend full of the peerless prowess of its hero, who puts down all before him, and meets with plenty of picturesque adventures; with fair ladies, and grey haired men, dwarfs and dwarfesses, blacks, and serpents, and sorceresses, all which is pleasant to read as the autumn-storms set in, by a good fire, with the rain and hail dashing on the windows, and two or three eager children sympathising most exultingly in the real triumphs of the mighty champion. The part is also illustrated with some beautiful wood-cuts, facsimile specimens of the Welsh and Icelandic MS. copies of these stories, and a sufficiency of interesting notes.

Literary Intelligence.

Just Published.

Voyages of the Dutch Brig of War *Dourga*, through the Southern and Little-known parts of the Moluccan Archipelago, and along the previously unknown Coast of New Guinea, performed during the years 1825 and 1826. By H. Rolff, Jun. Translated from the Dutch by George Windsor Earl.

The North American Review. No. 105.

Extracts from Holy Writ, and Various Authors, intended as helps to Meditation and Prayer, principally for Soldiers and Seamen. By Captain Sir Nesbit J. Willoughby.

The Catholic Doctrine of the Triune God, proved from two hundred and nine Texts in the Old and New Testaments. To which is annexed Remarks on forty Texts, said to be the grand foundation of Socinianism. By Charles Douglas Hope.

The Governess. By the Countess of Blessington. Two volumes.

A Diary in America, with Remarks on its Institutions. Part Second. By Captain Marryatt, C.B. Three volumes.

Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans: with Remarks on the Commentaries of Dr. Macknight and Professor Moses Stuart. By Robert Haldane, Esq. Vol. III.

Texas: Its Claims to be recognized as an Independent Power by Great Britain, Examined in a Series of Letters. By John Scoble.

Hints for an Essay on Anemology and Ombrology, with a Weather Almanack for 1840. By Peter Legh, Esq., M.A.

The Sons of the Soil. A Poem. By Mrs. Ellis.

Chapters on the Modern History of British India. By Edward Thornton, Esq.

The Pictorial History of Palestine. Part II.

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspeare. Part 14.

Edwards on Revivals: with Introductory Preface, by the Rev. J. A. James; and Carefully Revised, with Notes and Introduction by the Rev. W. Patton, D.D.

Lectures on Revivals of Religion. By Charles G. Finney. With Introductory Prefaces by Rev. J. A. James, Rev. G. Payne, D.D., and Rev. N. S. Beman, D.D. With Notes and carefully revised by Rev. W. Patton, D.D.

The Revival of Religion. A Narrative of the State of Religion at Wycliffe Chapel, during the year 1839.

The Day of Pentecost. A Sermon Preached at Leeds, June 6, 1839, before the West Riding Auxiliary Missionary Society. By Andrew Reed, D.D.

Lives of the Most Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of Great Britain. English Poets. By Robert Bell, Esq. Vol. II.

Special Religious Services improved and vindicated. By the Rev. Thomas Milner, A.M.

Letters from Palestine: written during a Residence of three years, in the years 1836, 1837, and 1838. By the Rev. D. Paxton.

Bacchus. An Essay on the Nature, Causes, Effects, and Cure of Intemperance. By Ralph Barnes Grindrod.

Ward's Library. History of the Hebrew Commonwealth. Translated from the German of John Jahn, D.D. By Calvin E. Stowe, A.M.

The History of the Moravian Mission among the Indians in North America, from the Commencement to the Present Time. With a Preliminary Account of the Indians from the most authentic Sources. By a Member of the Brethren's Church.

Popery Unveiled, in Six Lectures.

Self Defence. The Ministers of the Established Church not the only true Ministers of Christ; nor the Church of England the only sure road to Heaven. A Sermon preached at Cowbridge Chapel, Hertford. By Isaac Anthony.

Practical Reflections on the Sufferings and Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Rev. F. A. Gonthier.

Help to the Schoolmistress; or Village Teaching. By Emily Taylor.

Old Humphrey's Addresses.

Hints on Etiquette and the Usages of Society; with a Glance at Bad Habits. 19th edition revised (with additions) by a Lady of Rank.

Lectures on Revivals of Religion. By William Sprague, D.D. With a Preliminary Essay on the Psychology of Religious Revivals. By a Scottish Minister.

Repton's Landscape Gardening and Landscape Architecture. A New Edition. By J. C. Loudon, F.L.S. Part 6.

A General Outline of the Animal Kingdom and Manual of Comparative Anatomy. By Thomas R. Jones, F.Z.S.

A History of British Birds. By William Yarrell, F.Z.S. Part 15.

An Encyclopædia of Rural Sports. By D. P. Blaine. Part 3.

The Pilgrim's Progress: in two parts. By John Bunyan. With Original Notes by the Rev. Thomas Scott. 8vo.